UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Duke University Library
JUL 26 1941

JULY, 1941

Philosophy in Renaissance Art ..... Herbert L. Stewart
American Politics: Reports from Men in Action ..... J. T. Salter
Anatole France and His Critics ..... J. S. Will
The War and Opinion:
I. The Defence of Great Britain ..... Edgar McInnis
II. Britain's Home Guard ..... P. L. Carver
III. Planning of Canada's War Effort ..... A. Brady
The Reform of the Laws of England, 1640-1660 ..... Goldwin Smith
Austrian Origins of National Socialism ..... H. Gordon Skilling
"O France! Thy Bleeding Body . . .": A Protest ..... George V. Ferguson

Reviews:
European Poetry ..... Felix Walter
Background for Milton ..... A. S. P. Woodhouse
Christianity and Classical Culture ..... Reinhold Niebuhr
Union Now with Britain ..... F. H. Soward

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED
Distributors

The Bishop Strachan School

COLLEGE HEIGHTS, TORONTO

Established over 67 years

President: THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO

A CHURCH RESIDENTIAL AND DAY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

Kindergarten to Junior and Senior Matriculation

Principal: Miss Lowe, B.A., Toronto
Vice-Principal: Miss Rosseter,
Cheltenham and Froebel Institute

CHINESE

TEMPLE FRESCOES

A New Study by

BISHOP W. C. WHITE

A technical-historical study of three large wall-paintings of the Thirteenth Century which formerly adorned the walls of Buddhist and Taoist temples in Shansi, China.

$4.00 *(plus 25c. postage)*

The University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada

RELIANCE ENGRAVERS LIMITED

104 BOND ST. TORONTO

ARTISTS · ENGRAVERS · ELECTROTYPERS

PHONE ELGIN 0411

OUR EXPERIENCE WILL SAVE YOU MONEY

5

CONTENTS

VOL. X JULY, 1941 No. 4

Philosophy in Renaissance Art ..... HERBERT L. STEWART 401

American Politics: Reports from Men in Action J. T. SALTER 417

Anatole France and His Critics ..... J. S. WILL 435

The War and Opinion:

I. The Defence of Great Britain ..... EDGAR MCINNIS 450

II. Britain's Home Guard ..... P. L. CARVER 453

III. Planning of Canada's War Effort ..... A. BRADY 466

The Reform of the Laws of England, 1640-1660 GOLDWIN SMITH 469

Austrian Origins of National Socialism H. GORDON SKILLING 482

"O France! Thy Bleeding Body . . .": A Protest GEORGE V. FERGUSON 493

Reviews:

European Poetry ..... FELIX WALTER 497

Background for Milton ..... A. S. P. WOODHOUSE 499

Christianity and Classical Culture REINHOLD NIEBUHR 505

Union Now with Britain ..... F. H. SOWARD 511

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

P. L. CARVER, well known to our readers for his scholarly studies, in this issue writes from observation on Britain in her crisis.

GEORGE V. FERGUSON, Managing Editor of the *Winnipeg Free Press*, is one of the authors of *Canada Fights* (1941), reviewed in this number of the QUARTERLY.

EDGAR McINNIS, Assistant Professor of History in the University, and author of the *Oxford Periodical History of the War*, has been recently appointed a visiting professor at Bowdoin College.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, Professor of Christian Ethics in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, has published his Gifford lectures under the title *Human Nature and Human Destiny* (1941).

J. T. SALTER, Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin, is the author, among other works, of *Boss Rule: Portraits in City Politics* (1935), and *The Pattern of Politics* (1940).

H. GORDON SKILLING, a graduate of the University, held an official position in Czechoslovakia, and is now a member of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin.

GOLDWIN SMITH, a graduate of the University, and Assistant Professor of History in the State University of Iowa, has written *The Treaty of Washington, 1871: A Study in Imperial History* (1941).

F. H. SOWARD, a graduate of the University, and Professor of History in the University of British Columbia, has made a special study of international relations.

H. L. STEWART is Professor of Philosophy in Dalhousie University and Editor-in-chief of the *Dalhousie Review*.

FELIX WALTER, Professor of French in Trinity College, is the author of a study of Portuguese influence on English literature with emphasis on the Romantic period.

J. S. WILL is Professor of French in University College.

PHILOSOPHY IN RENAISSANCE ART

HERBERT L. STEWART

JUDGING by the treatment of the Renaissance period in most of our histories of philosophy, one must conclude that it was philosophically a sterile period, a tract barren in itself, although significant as the approach to an area of copious production. In this article I propose to discuss some aspects of the thought of that time, which suggest a very different estimate. Its men of genius were artists, but in their masterpieces of brush or chisel some of them left abundant evidence that they were more than artists. In their statues and their pictures they presented conceptions of the world and of life from which the subtle reasoners of a time to come had much to learn. "The sensibility of the artist," wrote George Eliot, "seizes combinations which science explains and justifies." This is, I think, conspicuously illustrated by works of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century art, supplying to nineteenth- and twentieth-century dialectic many a text and many a stimulus.

I

Great pictures executed in the fourteenth century show how austere was the devotion which an Italian painter then imported into his work. Whether he felt it or merely simulated it, here was a professional requirement; when later painters obtruded "nature" and "the natural," the shock was distinct. Although a grave and chastened beauty still arrests the eye in the paintings of a Masaccio or a Fra Angelico, one is always conscious of the religious limits within which talent had there to be exercised. It recalls Dr Johnson's warning against pulpit eloquence—that "contrition has not leisure for tropes and metaphors"; or, again, the studiously monotonous tone in which John Henry Newman would read scripture from the lectern in St Mary's, on his guard lest the modulations of an exquisite voice should divert thought from the essence of worship to its form. Not in those distant Middle Ages alone has one met the notion that even natural spontaneity, still more any sort of deliberate contrivance, profanes the work of a divine messenger, and that the commission from

God should be executed with such neglect of "the graces" as will preserve its isolated awe. It was the glory of Giotto to have discerned and exemplified the possibility of drawing sacred scenes with a truth to human nature by which their devotional effect should be neither marred nor interrupted but intensified: "one music as before, but vaster." More than a century, however, had to elapse before this conception of art at once humanized and spiritualized, each element reinforcing rather than obstructing the other, was brought back by Leonardo da Vinci. His Madonna actually smiled: it was an example of a change which went far. Not in such a picture as the *Mona Lisa* alone, but in the *Last Supper* and in the *Virgin of the Rocks*, it became clear that a new cycle of thought in art had developed with the Renaissance. During the long interval, however, between Giotto and Leonardo, it was within the limits not merely of a strict but of a narrow mediaeval orthodoxy that the greatest painters were imprisoned. The wonder is that even under such handicap they gave us so much that is immortal.

Dante was for them an unfailing source: in the *Paradiso*, the *Inferno*, and the *Purgatorio* the artists of the fourteenth century found material whose inspiration they could never exhaust. Unlike the epic poet of Puritanism, in whose circle art was suspected as commonly and perhaps necessarily irreligious, the epic poet of Catholicism had his conceptions rapidly and eagerly symbolized in painting. About the time when Boccaccio was copying Dante's poem devoutly with his own hand, and composing his commentary on its contents, innumerable church walls were being decorated with pictures of which this was the obvious origin.

For example, that extraordinary picture, *The Triumph of St Thomas Aquinas*. Among those whom Dante, conducted by Beatrice on his tour through Heaven, saw there in a place of high honour was the famous philosophic controversialist who defended the Faith in *Summa contra Gentiles*. How the intellectual Aquinas, in the abode of bliss, viewed St Francis, there also, but with a record of quite different order, is set forth in a striking passage of the *Paradiso*. To our way of thinking, it would seem that while habits of humble devotion, especially amid natural scenes, lend themselves to the painter's art, there is scant inspiration for the brush in a dispute about Ontology. But for that age, so fortunate

—as Carlyle thought—in having a clear *Credo* under which all mundane activities could be ranged in their respective degrees of importance, the case was different. A thinker who perfected the dialectical instrument, and overthrew once for all the sceptics or compromisers who had tampered with it, was held worthy of that public tribute which a church decorator alone could bring. At a time when dogma meant so much, the champions of dogma were among the holiest of men, and the thoughts of a worshipper must be educated to appreciate them. St Francis himself was drawn by Giotto in controversy with Moslems. So on a side wall of the Spanish Chapel of Santa Maria Novella we find the glorification of Aquinas. Seated in the centre as on a throne, angels hovering over him to symbolize the seven cardinal virtues, saints of the Bible in rows on either side, the victor in that great battle for dogma has under his feet the three arch-heretics, Arius, Sabellius, Averroës. The educative purpose of the picture is completed by figures typical of the arts and sciences of the day, each exercising its special function in the order assigned it by the synthesizing genius of Aquinas. Everywhere in the detail, most plainly perhaps in the medallion ornaments of the chairs, the student of Dante can identify at once the literary source.

One further example, from the opposite wall of the same chapel, will suffice to illustrate this use of fourteenth-century art. It bears the imposing title *Church Militant and Triumphant*. A truly amazing combination in a single picture of those in Heaven and upon Earth who have fought for the Faith, some drawn recognizably in person, some under easily decipherable symbolism. Pope and Emperor are there, with crozier and sword. Sheep guarded by spotted dogs suggest the function of Dominican friars in black and white uniform (popularly known, through suggestive pun on their name, as "Hounds of the Lord"), while other such dogs, tearing gray wolves to pieces, plainly recall the Dominican heresy-hunter. There too we see St Dominic himself, in obviously triumphant confutation of heretics, one of his followers preaching to an eager general audience, and St Peter standing with his keys at the heavenly portal to which the crowd is being earnestly directed. Often in such church decorations we encounter what seems to the modern eye grotesque, just as there is much that seems for a like reason grotesque in Dante, beyond the power of even his poetic

genius to redeem. But, in the paintings as in the poem, genius is ever startling us with some stroke of incomparable imagery. Never surely was pictorial teaching, in the absence of teaching of other kinds, used at once with such systematic zeal and with such artistic success.

II

Lecky has remarked[1] that, at the Renaissance, the age of the cathedrals had passed and the age of the printing-press had begun. It is a comparison and a contrast worth pursuing in detail.

Before the invention of printing made it possible to multiply books on a great scale at a low cost, the instrument of universal culture was the ritual of the Church, supplemented by the symbolism of Christian art. Here was not merely a constant appeal to the eye: it solicited the eye when all other forms of appeal were absent. When religion could still be described as the one romance of the poor, the artist concentrated his talent upon portrayal of the scenes in Bible story or in devout legend. The effectiveness with which the *ethos* of the common people was thus developed made so anti-clerical a writer as Auguste Comte devise for Positivism in the nineteenth century a liturgic ceremonial copied from those Ages of Faith. In the mediaeval cathedrals, he said, might be found the most perfect expression of man's moral nature, and the symbolism of that "frozen music" might with profit be studied by those who had modern knowledge rather than mediaeval superstition to propagate. Renaissance art, quite as clearly as Renaissance philosophy or history, began to show the great change.

It was a gradual process, but not a slow one. As in the field of literature the thinker was long required to subject his writings to ecclesiastical censorship and to make them at least compatible with authoritative dogma, so in mediaeval art—long limited to the decoration of churches—the human figure must be so presented as everywhere to convey orthodox dogma about the life and destiny of mankind. To exhibit human nature "for its own sake," to recognize that in their own right—apart from the use to which they might be turned under sacerdotal direction—the natural impulses of mankind had value fit for imaginative treatment, was

[1] *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (London, 1865), I, p. 259.

an enterprise of heresy, like the writing of an heretical book. But in both cases the heretic might, in his initial stages, artfully escape detection. The disguise under which Pomponazzi succeeded, and Galileo almost succeeded, in challenging the essence of dogma while acquiescing in its external mould, had still more suggestive illustration among the revolutionaries in art.

Even a superficial study of Italian paintings of the period is enough to disclose three respects in which the spirit of an earlier time had been changed. In some there is a fast developing sensuality, with no suggestion that any particular models of another age were being copied, but unmistakable in its display of the prevalent Italian licentiousness penetrating even "religious" art. In a second group the influence of rediscovered classical masterpieces, and of the traditions of ancient mythology there embodied, is apparent: alike in forms and situations and underlying *motif*, however careful the artist may be to supply at least a minimum of religious setting, it is the world of pagan, not of Christian, values that is presented. In yet a third group there is deliberate harmonizing of the leaders of classical pagan and of mediaeval Christian thought—a conscious "Modernism," with which painters of the sixteenth century anticipated the Comparative Religion of the nineteenth.

The "modernization" of devotional paintings began, with cautious and tentative change, when Fra Angelico died in 1455. It began with a just discernible emphasis on fleshly beauty, investing the new Madonnas with a personal charm. Soon it was being whispered that an Aphrodite or a Venus was in the artist's imaginative mind, and as we compare the sequence of earlier with that of later Madonnas, remembering the surge of interest in classical antiquity, this hint becomes convincing. It was a difference not merely of form, but of expression and attitude; not sudden, but all the more effective because it was gradual. Between a change which the devout could welcome as a new "naturalness" in the figures of a religious picture, and a change by which "Nature" not only ignored but mocked the scruples of devotion, there was room for many an intermediate stage. The *tempo* of the advance was suddenly quickened when it ceased to be the daring venture of some isolated artist, and a modernized art was proclaimed as the aesthetic policy of the Vatican. The Medicean Popes had no sympathy with the scruples or restraints of a Fra Angelico. A new

licence in pictures accompanied that encouragement of startling comedy characteristic of Leo X when, with his cardinals, he roared with laughter at a performance of Machiavelli's *Mandragola* or of *Julius Excluded from Heaven*.

It was not merely, or chiefly, from remains of classical antiquity that some of the new artists were known to be working. They began to insert in their pictures of sacred scenes the recognizable men of rank and influence in their own day: the figure of Lorenzo, for example, often appeared, in a setting—such as the *Adoration of the Magi*—meant to honour him. Before long, too, it was apparent that models still more objectionable than a Lorenzo or an Aphrodite were being used. Certain contemporary Florentines were identified as originals for a new Madonna, and their known character shocked pious feeling. It would shock a Catholic community still if the ideal picture even of a "Reverend Mother" had obvious source in some stage beauty of worse than questionable morals. The spirit of bygone piety had vanished indeed when in a new painting of the Virgin it was clear that such a model had posed for it in a studio.

A conspicuous herald of this change was the painter Filippo Lippi. In his pictures we first observe the figures of contemporary people, sometimes as probable models, occasionally even as unmistakable originals of the Madonna. That the person who paid for a painting should himself be shown on a side panel in an attitude of adoration was a venture in advertisement which does not seem to have incurred in the Florence of 1460 either the ridicule or the disgust that it would certainly incur now. But when Fra Lippi, himself under monastic vows, having eloped with the ward of a convent who was likewise bound to celibacy, executed a Madonna and Child with accompanying Angels in which the features of the fugitive nun were obvious, it required a very definite relaxation of scruple in the community to acquiesce. Scruple proved, indeed, sufficiently lax. Fra Lippi's artistic genius was allowed to compensate for his irregularities, and the subtle change which he wrought in other traditional practice was either unnoticed or approved: for example, the countenance of a heavenly messenger in one of the pictures of the Annunciation, or the figure of the artist himself conspicuous in the foreground of his *Burial of St*

Stephen: it is the freedom of later, not the piety of earlier art that is here asserting itself.

Highly typical, too, of a drift from mediaevalism was the revival of sculpture. This was a pagan art, under peculiar suspicion in the Ages of Faith, and "image-breaking" had not seldom been inculcated as a pious campaign. To popular Christian fancy, instigated or at least exploited by monks, Greek statues—symbolic of the old "heathen" religion—seemed a probable abode for demons, and they were everywhere smashed with the destructive fury of a crusade. Perhaps the pious motive was occasionally crossed by other motives less innocent, and the bronze, the ivory, or the gold which many Greek sculptors had used as their material presented a sordid temptation under the thin disguise of religious zeal. But such zeal was, on a wide scale, both sincere and passionate, so that the new fifteenth-century sculptors were an offence and an alarm to the devout. There was a shock, too, in certain new conceptions of church architecture which struggled for recognition about the same time.

Towards the middle of the fifteenth century, two young men from Florence—Brunelleschi and Donatello by name—were apprentices to a goldsmith in Rome. Unlike nearly everyone else, they there developed an intense interest in the ancient ruins, and employed their spare time on an exploration which onlookers guessed to be a treasure hunt. What was slowly arising in Brunelleschi's mind was a plan to restore the majestic type of structure in old Roman temples which Christian designs had displaced, and what Donatello meditated was a revived activity of the sculptor, executing again such statues as had been an ancient glory until Christian fanaticism had banished them. Not, indeed, that either of these daring young reformers proposed to challenge the world of mediaeval faith with a neopagan innovation! The statues which Donatello had in view were meant in the first instance as ecclesiastical adornments, scrupulously fitted to their environment among symbols of devotion in a church. The architectural schemes haunting the imagination of Brunelleschi were schemes to employ again, for effects of yet greater impressiveness in a Christian cathedral, the lost art of a Roman basilica. How far such adaptations, put forward under such pleas of apology or disguise, can be risked by a new order at work among the surroundings of an old

one, is always doubtful. Putting new wine into old bottles may involve risk not only for the fragility of the bottles but also for the quality of the wine. That in Donatello's statues and Brunelleschi's cupolas an altogether undevotional development had begun, many a Christian observer would timidly suggest, soon to to be silenced by a chorus of aesthetic experts. Within half a century, in the city of these artists' birth, a great "bonfire of vanities," lit at the bidding of Savonarola, showed how there at least the public had come to see more of pagan purpose than of religious decoration in the revived sculpture.

For the significance of the work of the chisel as revealing the deeper thought of the age, one turns to a study of the master-sculptor.

III

The career of Michelangelo was a succession of storms, outward and inward, from the quarrel with his father on his choice of art as a career, and his physical encounter with a fellow-apprentice in the studio which disfigured him for life, down to remorseful lament in the verse of his old age about abilities wasted on effort below the spiritual vocation of man. He was an enthusiastic, even an intolerant, republican; but the patronage of a great family and the necessities of a livelihood made him first the *protégé* and ultimately the employee of a despot. No doubt the ungracious mood in which he undertook his commission to decorate the burial-place of the Medicis is reflected in those "magnificent failures." In some respects nearest to his own temperament was that of his employer, Pope Julius II, whose terrific quality of strength and resoluteness he has shown in perhaps the most memorable of his statues. But the conflict of will between Julius and Michelangelo led repeatedly to collapse of some artistic project, and at least once to the spectacle of that most masterful Pope supplicating an offended artist to take up again the chisel he had flung down in a rage. Typical indeed was that last scene in the studio at Rome when, eighty years old, toiling again by night in studied concealment at the sculpture he had long given up, Michelangelo missed for once his old dexterous stroke, and was stopped just in time by the importunities of an attendant from destroying in disgust the whole group of statues on which he had worked.

But his deepest conflict, in his own mind not less than in his contact with his surroundings, was the source more of his triumphs than of his mistakes. It was the conflict of new knowledge, new thought, new artistic inspiration, with the mediaeval religious inheritance: for to ancient faith Michelangelo was as deeply devoted as he was thrilled by the challenge of the new time. His contemporary, Machiavelli, was disturbed by no such problem in synthesis: for him the embarrassments of the old creed were cast aside as easily as a worn-out cloak. That other contemporary, Raphael, shows not the least sign of a ruffled composure: his hospitable mind could exercise itself by turns on the varying Greek philosophic systems, the succession of classical bards, or the debate of Scholastic theologians about the Sacrament of the Mass, and with faultless artistry he would paint these by turns—a *School at Athens*, a *Parnassus*, a *Disputa*. In all such matters the brush of Raphael—like the Muse of History in Goethe's ironic judgment—will be at your disposal. As the historian will supply you to order with excellent reasons for whatever you may wish to believe, so that kind of artist will paint for you with a vividness equally convincing whatever situation in man's spiritual life you are most interested to contemplate. But such was not Michelangelo's conception of his office: he was not that kind of artist. If he could not keep his patience with the serene Raphael, if he was described not inappropriately as going through the streets of Florence "with the look of an executioner," the reason was no mere temperamental moroseness. So passionate an admirer of Dante can hardly have missed or have forgotten the passage about the guilt of those who have lived sullenly amid the beautiful things which Providence has provided. There was a problem in the Renaissance which, it seemed to Michelangelo, such men as Raphael had not only failed to appreciate, but were even contributing to conceal: a difficulty of thought that was for them no difficulty, not because it had been solved, but because it had never been realized. Raphael had not seen beyond it, but had merely failed to see it, and his serene temper was to his older contemporary an offence. Thus, in the most profound sense, the inner conflict in this master-sculptor's mind was his inspiration. Like Erasmus, he felt a summons to "Christianize the Renaissance," and—also like Erasmus—he discovered, as he went on, more and more

obstacles in the way of what he had undertaken. For it meant Christianizing the Medicean Popes, who had, for the time, in their charge all those great agencies through which a sculptor or a painter might interpret the Renaissance.

It was in the Medicean circle, indeed, that the critic's mood of reflectiveness had first been stirred, by men much more in earnest than the patron and organizer of their Conferences. One can well believe that Pope Leo X, as he bargained thirty years afterwards with the sculptor about decoration for his family vault, had "moments of memory"—recalling how as Giovanni de Medici he had so many contacts, in the days of his more ingenuous youth, with the boy Michelangelo Buonarotti, of almost exactly his own age, in his father's palatial Florentine home. That had been the young artist's place of refuge on dispute with his own father. The elder Buonarotti, belonging to what Thackeray would have called the "shabby genteel" of Florence, used to boast that he had never supplemented the meagre income of his estate by recourse to either a mercantile or a mechanical pursuit, and shared the view of Major Pendennis that artists were "damned disreputable." Lorenzo was at that point surely a friend in need! But it was to no mere rallying-place of the unconventional, no mere artistic *vie de Bohème*, that the boy was introduced. The Platonism he heard at Lorenzo's table in the daily converse of Politian, of Ficino, of Pico della Mirandola, sank deeply enough into his mind to inspire his sonnets written half a century later: sonnets about eternal values unseen, of which all that solicits and charms the eye of sense should be held merely emblematic, or about the soul quickened to life by a nobler soul, as the form that lies concealed in a block of marble is made actual by the sculptor's chisel. The challenge to thought in the Platonic Dialogues, then at length—after the neglect of centuries—brought back with peculiar zest by the very group to which young Michelangelo was introduced, found reinforcement before long in a different but kindred inspiration. In the texture of his developing mind one marks the blend of three elements: a dazzling native aptitude for art, the philosophic reasoning of the Platonists, and the preaching of the Dominican monk, Girolamo Savonarola. Does it seem, *prima facie*, strange that these should blend? Let a twentieth-century English Hellenist be here our suggestive guide. "Though in a thousand ways,"

writes Sir Richard Livingstone, "Plato is a Greek of the Greeks, in all that is most distinctive of his thought he is so far a heretic that if Hellenism had been a persecuting religion it would have been bound to send him to the stake. . . . His words might have been inscribed in the cells of Christian hermits to justify and sustain them in the austere asceticism of their retirement from the world."[2]

The development of the Vatican under Julius II and Leo X has been construed as a deliberate, carefully planned gesture from the mediaeval Church to the New Learning. So keen a critic as Professor Kraus of Munich[3] felt sure that Raphael, for example, in painting the *Camera della Segnatura*, was no mere artist following his own "subjective inspiration," but the employee of a Pontiff who prescribed for him the sequence of thought which these pictures should promote. They should accustom the eye to just that succession and interplay of ideas which had fascinated Leo in his Medicean youth: ideas of the Florentine Academy about pagan culture as at once preparing for the Christian revelation and suggesting the deficiencies which that revelation might make good. What was Raphael's *School at Athens* but a painting inspired by Marsilio Ficino's conception of the Platonic Academy? What was the *Parnassus* but a renewal on canvas of that tribute to classical bards which Dante in his great poem had paid two centuries before, which Erasmus was even then illustrating in an indisputably Catholic Humanism, and which the great Florentines of the Pope's own circle had shown him in his youth to be the truly religious attitude towards secular genius? Professor Kraus even finds evidence for his theory in Michelangelo's commission to present Pope Julius II as Moses. What else, we are asked, can it mean than that the Sovereign Pontiff was the new leader, to guide the Church from her degradation into the rich new inheritance of learning and intellectual development, all under the service of God? It requires, I think, considerable imagination to read all this into the *Moses* of San Pietro in Vincoli. Erasmus at least, who had better opportunities than Professor Kraus for judging what was in the mind of Julius II, has not so described him as to suggest an enthusiast for humane studies; still less has

[2]R. W. Livingstone, *The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us* (1912), pp. 183, 195.
[3]Cf. his "Medicean Rome," in *Cambridge Modern History*, II, p. 6.

he led us to think that Moses the Meek could have been chosen, except in satire, as a comparison for that dominating personality. But a gesture of spiritual welcome to the new time must have been intended in Raphael's paintings for the *Camera della Segnatura:* rooms eloquent, says Mr. H. M. Vaughan, of the liberal, easy-going, ostentatious, extravagant Medici Pope who from the first declared his intention to "enjoy the papacy."

More notable for my present purpose than any picture from the hand of Raphael are the *Sibyls* painted by Michelangelo on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel. There—among the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah—appear pagan figures whose story comes altogether from the pre-Christian classical myth, and whose associations are with a cult which to the mediaeval mind was sheer idolatry. The legend, both Greek and Roman, recurring for at least six hundred years, from the philosopher Heracleitus to the poet Vergil, attributed divine inspiration to certain prophetic women—a Phrygian, an Erythraean, a Delphian, a Persian, and half a dozen others who were named. So definite and so impressive was the tradition at Rome that sacred scriptures, in hexameter verse, of unknown authorship, old enough to be superstitiously venerated, were kept as a record of what the gods had made known through Sibylline channels, and supplied, under expert interpretation, oracular guidance at a time of national emergency. What was in the mind of Michelangelo when he thus presented heathen Sibyls as sharing with the prophets of the Bible the burden of a supernatural message? Here, not for the first time nor for the last, did the liberal spirit which had failed in the language of reasoning become effective in the language of symbol.

It is impossible to over-estimate what such adornment of the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel with the figures of pagan mythology, interspersed among those of the Church's reverential homage, must have conveyed to Michelangelo's generation. They are painted with the unmistakable purpose of making pagan oracles appear a real medium and agency of divine self-disclosure to mankind. No less than in the pictures of the prophets are form and expression and attitude made subtly suggestive of the divine messenger's character and task. Thus the project of Comparative Religion, which had suggested itself dimly and ineffectively to the Platonists of Florence, was advanced—perhaps without design, but not on

that account with less durable result—by the Florentine artists. If painters were successful where scientific analysts failed, the reason is not far to seek. Religions can never be unified by the detection of a common element of dogma, even though (with the members of the Florentine Academy) one strain to the utmost the resources of artificial interpretation that dogmas *prima facie* quite different may be made to coincide. For, in the first place, no genuinely common element of belief is thus discoverable, and, in the second place, even if it were, the source of a product so emotional as religion can never be found in a cold acquiescence of the intellect.

Michelangelo had spent only three years, the last three of Lorenzo's life, within the circle of intimate Laurentian influence, and he had been then but a boy in his early teens. He had been at the same time among those who listened, from week to week, with alternations of angry dissent and fascinated alarm, to the Dominican monk at St Mark's denouncing Lorenzo's vanities and tyrannies. It is not perhaps fanciful to conjecture yet another inspiration that affected him. In the Laurentian circle of aggressive culture he met Sandro Botticelli, the artist so honoured by Leonardo da Vinci (for a reason at which critics still have to guess) by mention of his name alone in the *History of Painting*. As we study Botticelli's pictures, we realize that he belongs not to the great upper circle, not to the few of his age "whose footsteps echo ever through the corridors of Time." But in that competition of unique severity for a prize it is no small honour to have been mentioned by so discerning a judge, and the work of this second-rank painter had manifest merits of its own which so caught Leonardo's eye as to win from him this capricious emphasis.

Botticelli is known to us, in the main, for his paintings in illustration of the *Divine Comedy*, and there for a curiously sympathetic treatment of figures that Dante seems to present for the reader's unmixed scorn. The *Inferno* tells us, for example, of angels that could not make up their minds which side to take in Lucifer's insurrection; with them the poet had obviously no patience, but the painter, illustrating the poet's work, could not look with such merciless rigour on those whose faculties may well have been sadly disproportionate to that fearful choice. He was touched with pity for the irresolute angels, and the suggestion

that they became later incarnate in our hesitating human race stirred him to present this sequence in a picture. It was thought so profane that the chapel in which it hung for a time was officially closed. But the venture which brings official reprobation has sometimes roused unofficial genius, and Botticelli's sympathy for his race reappears perhaps in many a painting by his far greater associate of the Laurentian circle.

It reappeared, too, in his own curiously provocative Madonnas, and the critic who had himself been an innovator in that field of painting may well have been quick to appreciate yet another change. Leonardo had made the Madonna smile, where his artistic predecessors had not dared thus to humanize, and he had proved this to be no loss but rather a gain in impressiveness. It was the artist's illustrative comment on the Nicene doctrine that Incarnation must preserve a true humanity. Botticelli interprets the Virgin still further. One feels this most clearly, I think, when—before his Madonna—one recalls the lines of the *Magnificat.* Study the expression, with its blend of dignity and weariness, of pride and alarm. Is there not a look of being oppressed by the burden of a fearful honour? A shrinking from the raptures of that unique motherhood? A touch of wistful longing to be back among an undistinguished kith and kin? Leonardo understood, as few indeed have ever understood, how the brush of a painter can reinterpret with effect all the more striking because it is elusive, and it was to him yet another achievement in art when such a new Madonna illustrated anew the familiar song. Though her soul might magnify the Lord, and she might know that coming generations would call her blessed, there was the haunting look of one who could wish that the honour had been bestowed elsewhere, and that to some other handmaiden it had fallen to lose her lowly but less responsible estate.[4]

It is the problem of mankind's lot, thus exemplified by the mingled mood of one of Botticelli's Madonnas, that Michelangelo constantly presents on a far greater scale and with far deeper vividness: the problem of a creature "half dust, half deity, unfit to sink or soar." With what point, then, has he been described

[4]This suggestion about Botticelli seems to have been first urged, and it was certainly developed with convincing force, by Walter Pater in his *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry* (London, 1873).

as "completing the secularization of art"? With no real point whatever. It was his glory that he not merely refused to promote, but vehemently and effectively resisted, just such a movement by his contemporaries. If his attitude to them was one of impatience passing at times into anger, he had good reason for it. The greatest painter of that Age was not formed, like them, by the Age alone. His sources were in the distant past, and his aspirations were for a distant future.

* * *

Walter Pater said it was a false opposition which set the art of the Renaissance in contrast with Christian art.[5] His protest is like the one so familiar in our books of Modernist theology, that the science and the historical criticism of our age involve no denial of the *essence* of the Faith. Superficially at least, historical critic and scientist do often seem to contradict the Christian theologian. In like manner the great Christian painters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries would have judged many a Renaissance picture not only pagan but blasphemous. Is the antagonism in either case, or in both cases, merely on the surface, to be dispelled by more searching analysis? It is with the case of art I am just here concerned, but the challenge in both is the same.

Ecstatic historians of the Renaissance like to dwell upon Goethe's behaviour at Assisi, when he turned aside in contempt from the church of St Francis that he might visit the shrine of Minerva. One is habitually reminded, too, of Hegel's joy at the spectacle of Philosophy restoring to man the treasures once wasted upon God, and of the altars of Eleusis, desecrated by fanatics of "Faith," being rebuilt in human hearts.[6] But the contrast may easily be exaggerated. Although the most notable, the Renaissance artists were not the first in post-classical times to make brush or chisel the instrument of generous thought about human nature. Nor was it always "classical models" which inspired them, directly or indirectly. No straining of the evidence can find in Giotto, for example, any such inspiration: his work was done at least a hundred years before the great dispersal of classical manuscripts and the search for classical remains began in earnest. But his

[5] *The Renaissance*, preface, p. xxviii.

[6] As shown in Hegel's poem addressed to Holderlein.

Three Vows of St Francis, and his pictures of scene after scene from the Evangelical Report, executed for the chapel at Padua, show how the revealing hand of Nature was being laid upon the sanctities previously guarded by a remote and austere symbolism. For those who delight in sharp contrast of periods, the spirit of the Renaissance is more suggestively opposed to what came after than to what had gone before: above all, to the mania of the coming "Counter-Reformation." At the touch of ecclesiastical reactionaries, indeed, artistic glory seemed to wither, suffering—as Pater remarks—far more from the "frozen orthodoxy" of the Catholic Revival than it had ever suffered from the iconoclasm of the Reformers.[7]

[7] *The Renaissance*, p. 73.

AMERICAN POLITICS: REPORTS FROM MEN IN ACTION

J. T. Salter

I

THE people's opinion of politics has changed from what it was when Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote, "All public ends look vague and quixotic beside private ones." For since the Depression settled on the United States its people have increasingly looked to their government—certainly a public end—to help them, for they no longer could help themselves. A Jefferson or Emerson, no matter how wise and revered, can only cause us to think how times have changed, when he says, "The less government we have, the better—the fewer laws, and the less confided power."

For the majority of our people believe that the best government is the one that is most useful to them. It is a service institution. Washington is no longer an abstract entity way off there that the voter can't quite keep his mind on.

It now seems, and this is doubly true since Hitler's armies have marched against the world, that public ends come first in the minds of the people, for only if they are right can private ends prosper. People are beginning to see that politics and life are one. They cherish that life and on November 5 they went to the polls to protect it.

Not only did more millions vote in the Presidential election in 1940 than ever voted before, but probably more people made up their own minds, reacted less positively to such symbols as Republican and Democratic (grand old party names), and acted more independently of party workers, than ever had before. This positive attitude on the part of the voter was particularly marked in great metropolitan centres like Philadelphia where party organization was once very strong. That the voters tended to disregard party names is suggested by the fact that the Democratic Roosevelt was elected. This could not have happened without the support of millions of people who were once Republicans. For there are not enough Democrats in the country to win a national election.

The independence of party organization is all the more interesting in light of the ancient fact that here in the United States, more than in any other democratic country, party organization is highly developed, and has been strongly entrenched and effective in

winning voters. The unofficial political party is usually more powerful than the official government, and the party organization is the bony structure or skeleton of the party. The major parties are national in scope and their organizations cover the country. For example, there are forty-eight states and these states are in turn divided into counties, cities, wards, precincts, and rural areas called towns and townships. Each of these divisions and subdivisions holds public elections. And in every district in which a person is elected there is a corresponding party committee.

The party structure forms a pyramid with the national committee at the apex and the precinct committees at the base. There are more than 130,000 precincts in the United States, and there is a precinct committee—on paper at least—composed of a varying number of members—usually from one to several, in each of them. Party committees, more than official governments, conform to human facts; some are moribund all the time, or all the time save for a brief interim around election day, but others are like a taxicab company subject to call from a voter in need at any hour of the day or night.

Because of the nature of the problem and without regard to what the law may say, the real committee is most likely to be a one-man affair, plus his co-workers, or assistants. In certain vigorously contested elections, and in areas where the organization is very strong, a leader in a precinct may have as many as fifty assistants, the most active of whom are commonly called ward heelers.

Philadelphia is a city of two million people; and until the Depression took away employment, and the magnetic Roosevelt came bearing gifts in the form of jobs and relief cheques, it had been solidly Republican. The dominant Republican organization was the government. It picked the candidates, and the people invariably elected those that the Republicans picked. From 1892 until 1936 Philadelphia went Republican in every election, and the returns were not even close.

The city is divided into 51 wards and 1,317 precincts, or (as they are called in Philadelphia) divisions. There are two Republican ward committeemen, or division leaders, in each division, but usually one is the recognized leader and the other is his lieutenant. In normal times the strongest division leader—i.e., in the areas where the people are weakest economically and culturally—

can control the vote of his constituency as surely as I can control my own vote. He can do this because his voters are often in need, and he can do services for them that the voters cannot do for themselves. Besides, the voter in a great city may feel alone or bewildered and the leader is friendly. He makes the voter feel that he "belongs," and he "domesticates the universal" for an individual that can't quite see beyond his neighbourhood. In a certain sense, and until the collapse of prosperity, it might have been said of the strongest division leader what Randolph of Roanoke once said of himself: "Time, the mighty reformer and innovator, has silently and slowly, but surely changed the relation between us; and I now stand to them [his constituents] *in loco parentis*—in the place of a father and receive from them a truly filial reverence and regard. Yes . . . they are my children who resent with the quick love of children all my wrongs, real or supposed."[1]

The leader of this tiny political domain, the division, was something of a father, or a shepherd looking after his flock, and his people were more likely to think of his smile and greetings and personal services done for them, than to resent his wrongdoings. He has won victories for his party in the old days that the leading candidate or the issue could not win.

Several years ago I wrote in my book, *Boss Rule: Portraits in City Politics*, that "the powerful division leader's part in the formulation of public opinion . . . is similar to the action of neutralizers in chemistry or of insulators in electricity." My point was that the division leader gained the support of voters because he did favours for them throughout the year, but he usually refrained from discussing public questions with them. And in the past—before Roosevelt—it was often possible to do this because the public question and the opposition candidate were "way off there"—too far away to be meaningful to the lone voter. His division leader—Tony Nicollo—was near at hand, but a John W. Davis or a James M. Cox were shadowy figures, or just names without individual significance. More often than not the metropolitan voter in congested districts saw the issue of the campaign in this fashion—Tony Nicollo vs. X (the unknown).

But it was different in 1940. And the most vivid way I can describe this difference in the common people's attitude toward the

[1] *Annals of Congress*, 1807-8, p. 23.

ballot is by presenting certain letters—a few from many—that I have just received from division leaders.

II

The first is from a bright energetic law-school graduate who has been actively working for the Republican ticket in Philadelphia since 1930. (You will find that President Roosevelt was not a shadowy figure or an X "way off there," but some one so real that it seemed that he was sitting at the voter's table, morning, noon, and night.)

"As you must know, the results of the election were quite a disappointment. The defeat of Mr Willkie was bad enough, but losing the state really hurt. The Auditor General's and the State Treasurer's officers were at stake, and believe me, I do mean 'steak,' or should I have said 'pork'? These offices were won by the Democrats four years ago when the Great White Father ran for his second term, and if we Republicans could have recaptured them now (as we hoped to), we would have really won something. Patronage has been pretty scarce for the Democrats since they lost the State two years ago and the loss of these two offices would have completely demoralized the local organization. That's that!

"As far as arguments from voters are concerned, there weren't any, at least downtown, and I imagine the condition to which I am about to refer was fairly general.

"The voters wanted Roosevelt. They wouldn't listen to arguments or reasons which might dissuade them from their fealty to Mr Big. We weren't dealing with voters who might be influenced by reasoning, we were confronted by an 'emotion.' I don't think Roosevelt could have done anything prior to the election which would have swerved them from their determination to vote for him. Theirs was the blind, unyielding belief that 'the King can do no wrong.'

"Conscription, alien fingerprinting and registration, and suggested mass calisthenics—all smacking of a foreign flavor—in no way concerned them (the voters). The same policies, suggested by anyone else, would have caused an outcry of 'Hitlerism.' But anything Mr Big did or does is O.K. They just have no fear where he is concerned. And this went too, so far as the 'third term' question was concerned."

The next letter is from Jim Terral, a Republican ward politician in a section of Philadelphia known as the tenderloin. Jim is the graduate of a grade B university, has an alert brain, a quick eye, and an indefinite number of constituents who believe with Emerson that a good man must not obey the law too well. Since Mr Terral knows that "the law is only a memorandum," he and his people work well together. He is prepared to do what it takes to win, but he found Hitler and Willkie too big a liability in his Jewish division. Past favours counted not at all in face of present fear.

"While on the whole it is believed the Republican Presidential candidate of 1940 made a better run than the like candidate of 1936, to us along the Waterfront area in Philadelphia it was much worse, more uncontrollable, more disastrous, more bitter and more humiliating.

"In 1936 Hitler had not yet taken over Czecho-Slovakia, Poland or any of the other countries from which hail the dwellers in our area. Roosevelt in that year had not yet incurred the full hatred of the Dictators. Landon had innuendos of backing by the Nazis and Fascists, but compared to what were blasted at Willkie, the 1936 tone was merely a whisper.

"In our section all sorts of this foreign propaganda had the most dire effect—the third term issue meant nothing. The ignorant Jews were in a panic—they actually thought their lives were in danger, their existence in peril. So ingrained was this alarm that we Republican division leaders were reviled and spat at! Sometimes it took the form of 'You, a Jewish boy to be for Hitler. Shame on you!' 'We know what Roosevelt is, but we don't know what Willkie will do. Why take a chance?' Even our own Christian colleagues thought all Jews were for Roosevelt and they used to 'ride' me by asking, 'Whom are you going to vote for?'

"So much for the Jewish element. The bigger surprises were the Poles, Slavs and Italian voters. They appeared to be silent and mild compared to the Jews. But when I ferreted them out in my canvass, I learned they, too, were dead set against us. Many Poles said to me, 'Listen! A German is a German, remember that. Once a German, always a German!' It didn't get me anywhere to point out that Willkie was born in the U.S., his father likewise was born in the U.S., his grandfather ran out of Germany to escape persecution.

"The colored boys, too, were instilled with this European

propaganda. So you see what effect the Old World turmoil had in our section.

"Also we had to deal with the 'Reliefers' who were afraid they would have to again sell apples. Too, the defense boom gave jobs to some in the Navy Yard and Arsenal, let alone the promises the Democrats made to get these jobs. This meant whole families switched to protect their 'good fortune.' Even the fact that Willkie promised to continue the defense measures was unavailing because the people believed 'Republicans always economize in wages paid to the public.'

"Finally, in the closing days of the campaign, Roosevelt had his 'Martin, Barton and Fish,' while we had our 'McCracken and Johnson.' You can realize what effect the McCracken 'bloomer' that 'only paupers will vote for Roosevelt' and General Johnson's Major Ginsburgh's 'Vy not?' had in our precincts. Really, in some divisions it was theatrical—the Democrats had shabbily dressed men wearing 'stove-pipe' hats with very large buttons announcing, 'I am a pauper for Roosevelt.' Others had boxes of apples, not selling them, but giving them away.

"In my first canvass almost a month before the election I could readily see I would be beaten by 200, so set and bitter were the constituency. Therefore, I worked on this angle with those doubtful ones I thought owed me some obligation. I told them I would lose the division by 200. I assured them I couldn't carry the division. Then I tried to impress upon them their vote for the Republican ticket would not affect the results in this division—Roosevelt would carry it—so deep in the hole am I. 'Now forget that Roosevelt or Willkie is running. I alone am running and I must put up some kind of a front.' Then I asked them if there was any reason why *I* should be humiliated by a 200 beating in view of the services and favors I had rendered and have been rendering. 'No' was the answer always. So I asked those to promise to pull the Republican lever for my sake only. 'In this way I shall be able to put up a respectable appearance—a beating by 150 or at best by 100.'

"These people, too, agreed that an outsider would look upon a 200 beating as a rebuke to a committeeman for not serving his people—a reflection upon the political workers—which wasn't true in my case. Nevertheless, I *was* beaten by 195 on the Presidential end and by 186 on the State ticket. I knew all along that some of

my 'friends' were lying in their word, but I never thought I wouldn't get *any* consideration. I admire a person who would tell me his convictions won't let him swerve, but to promise and then think he has fooled me and has gotten away with it makes me uncontrollably 'mad.'

"Five hundred votes were cast in our precinct. Virtually all came out without being called. As I told you in 1936 when voters flock to the polls right away at the opening and continue all day, we know we are in for a trouncing. 1936 was mild compared to 1940's nightmare.

"I never saw the 'kids' take such an interest in an election as in this one. They were even more rabid in their partisanship than their parents. They even stood outside the polls all day hollering 'Roosevelt'!"

Tom Cole, one of the nine characters in my book *Boss Rule: Portraits in City Politics*, has never gone to any university, but he often speaks of religion. He has been the leader of his division for about fifty years. He tells me that F.D.R. is the only candidate who has ever beaten him.

"You state I lost by 400 votes, but that must have been the 10th division. We have rearranged the divisions in the ward, and the old 10th (mine) is now 69th. I lost the division by 224 votes.

"The last two elections I carried the district for the Republican candidates from top to the bottom, but this man Roosevelt could win against the Lord in my division. The people tell me they will vote for anyone for me except any opponent of Roosevelt.

"I believe the President has created class and religious hatred and this has caused the foreign element to become leaders in this disunity of creeds and races and they believe Roosevelt is for the mob and poor underdog of this America. On the other hand they had nothing personally against Willkie but objected to him because he was the opposition of the so-called Democratic Party.

"I believe religion played a great part in this campaign, the God-fearing people were almost solidly behind Mr Willkie, but unfortunately America's God-fearing people are not in the majority.

"The vast majority of the foreign-born have no respect for church or our laws and principles, and thus our arguments for our traditions, laws and [the] like were not considered.

"Until Roosevelt honestly attempts to bring unity to this nation and eliminate class hatred, the Republican Party will have a

terrific struggle in overcoming the hate the New Deal has instilled in the voters' mind.

"I found I could talk to the American-born people and the intelligent voters about Willkie, and in fact they supported him, but [with] the foreigners, and uneducated voters, it was impossible to discuss the issues of the campaign. They wanted Roosevelt whether it meant war, or what have you.

"They seemed to think he gives you even the air we breathe and it would be a desecration to vote against him."

Tony Nicollo, another character in *Boss Rule*, is a superior Italian-American, around forty, and although he lives in a river-front ward, he has unmistakable standards. He is a detective for the county, an assistant to the ward leader, a successful leader of a division—many of whose people are of Italian descent. He does not mention this fact here, but I am told that it had a bearing on the final vote.

"Another election is over and so is another headache.

"These elections of today are terrific and in my humble opinion I think that if a committeeman goes through with ten of these campaigns and takes them to heart the way I do—what I mean is the spirit to win, not just kid around and whatever happens let it happen—I am sure he won't be in good health, being even lucky if he does not drop dead, as you often read these days another 'Committeeman dropped dead.'

"You know there used to be a time when the voter went to the polls with no other reason in mind but to help the committeeman; now it's just the other way around, *they go to the polls to help themselves*.

"Well, getting down to this last campaign, I can assure you it was no pudding, but it was good, real honest-to-goodness hard work and strategy. Now to begin with the people were silent, not expressing themselves to any one. If we called on them they would very nicely let us in and then state, well you don't have to worry about us, we're for you; but then I knew that the other side was getting the same reception, and in my own division, the other side were very confident about carrying the division. I then formed a committee of two women in each street, and I had them cover same, and I made sure that the two women in every case were the most capable and came from families who are highly respected in the street they live in. I then called a meeting of

these women only, and asked them to take care of their own street, by canvassing every house, and reporting back to me, and at the same time I put two men on every street, and their job was to do nothing except watch where and in what houses the Democrats would get in, then go right in back of them and cover up and find out what progress was made, and knock down whatever progress was made, so you see it was a case of dog eat dog. But I can say right here that nothing the committeeman could say or do on the other side was worth anything; they had the greatest committeeman of all times, in the hidden person of Franklin D. 'Boy what a man!' To a lot of people he is their God. Well, we had to get around this great man, so I used the old story that regardless of who was to win he could do so without our division, that it meant a lot for me to carry the division, and in the event of them needing a favor they could go neither to the President nor to Willkie, but that I was on the job ready to serve them at any hour or place. So it worked pretty good, as a great number of the voters felt well I'm for the President but I'll vote for Tony Nicollo. So as you already know I carried the division by 196 majority."

The above letters are from leaders in districts where the tradition is to vote as the Republican organization says. But on November 5, they voted for whom they pleased. The voters are thinking of what is happening beyond their neighbourhood.

III

The voters in the small towns and rural areas of Wisconsin, unlike their counterparts in the congested areas of Philadelphia, were divided in their choice for President. First, Wisconsin is in the Middle West, and the Middle West is more isolationist than is the Atlantic Seaboard. Next, Wisconsin is the home of the La Follettes and the La Follettes have been working with their might and lung power to defeat the lend-lease bill's aid to Britain. Third, the people in rural areas and small towns are less often for Roosevelt than are the common people in the cities. Fourth, the voters in Wisconsin are invariably better informed and better trained than elsewhere. However, their position and training has tended to make them think in terms of their state rather than the world. They do think, however, and their vote for a Democratic president, a Republican governor, and a Progressive senator, indicates that they think of men rather than parties. Again to show the quality

of their thought, I shall quote two successful candidates the state Assembly. (The Assembly is the lower house of state Legislature. It is composed of 100 members.) The first individual that I shall describe is Henry Fabian, who managed to get elected without even disclosing his presidential choice. (This could not have happened, for example, in Philadelphia.)

Henry Fabian was elected to the state Assembly on the Progressive ticket. He is in his middle twenties and has spent several years in the state university, where he took part in varsity debating. He was forced to drop school because of lack of funds, but, said he, "I am coming back." He has always been interested in politics. "When I first came to the U., I passed the Capitol and said, 'I am going to get elected to the legislature some day.'" And then after his recent election he visited the Capitol again. As the great dome came into view, he said, "I am going to get elected to Congress some day." And he will. I should add that he has already been elected to the school board back home. When I asked the reason, he replied, "To practise up—to get known, and besides I have a sister who will want to teach school in a couple of years. I got on the school board so I would be sure that she would have a job to teach in."

Henry is a big boy with a mannish look. He is about six feet and thick and heavy. He seems coarse-grained, physically powerful and "of the people." In the 1940 campaign some of the voters thought he was too young. So he put on a pair of spectacles, turned the brim of his heavy felt hat up all around, and carried a dark brief case. "After that they thought I was an attorney. You know I was a candidate for the assembly in 1938 and I lost. Well this time I used all I learned then, and a few more besides."

"Many people do not know it, but I am a Catholic. I tried to keep religion out of it. I told only the priests and the nuns, and I think that helped me. When the voters asked the church I attended, I tried to pass it off as a joke and said, 'I go to the round church.'

"I tried the same sort of a trick when they asked how I was voting for President. As I had the support of the Democratic party from the start as well as the backing of my own party, the Progressive party, I would seem to lean toward Roosevelt. But I also had about 1,000 Republicans backing me, so I most certainly had to keep my presidential choice a secret.

At first I tried to evade the question by saying that I was for Gracie Allen for president whenever I was asked—but I was accused of being too flippant—so I devised a method whereby I would say that I had been so busy with my own campaign that I had not the time to study the issues involved in the national campaign, and that I was so undecided that I would not know how to vote until I had studied the issues. Then I would ask them to explain the issues more fully to me. I found that there is nothing better a man likes to do than to swing a potential vote for his side—and so I did not lose any votes on that issue. All the fellows tried to convert me, and I converted them to my election cause. It worked very well. However, whenever a Willkie and a Roosevelt man started to argue in my presence, I would plead a previous appointment, and walk away.

"I used a 'Henry Fabian for Assembly' club in my campaign—said club being composed of my campaign manager, his wife, my mother, my fiancée, and my uncle. (It had to have at least five members according to law.) The club issued all the literature—and it could say nice things about me, which I could not say about myself. Also any donations to my campaign could be made to the club, although I did not permit donations to be accepted until the last week—after I had spent all of my $400.00 Then about all I—the association—took was $50.00 from a brewery.

"One night I was slated to make a speech in a small town. At the last minute I couldn't go. But my young brother—in army uniform—said he would make the speech for me. The people liked him. He made more speeches in the same township—always in uniform. I carried that township. I was the only member of my party to carry it.

"In the other city in my district there lived an influential family by the name of Fabian. One of them is a labor leader, another is the secretary of an industrial organization, and a third is the owner of a funeral home. In that city I just used a number of big placards, 'Elect Fabian member of the Assembly—Progressive.' I gained a lot of votes there from people who thought they were voting for one of their townspeople. When someone would ask me their relationship to me, I would say, 'My grandfather's cat once ran through their grandfather's back yard'—and so I would not be pressed for a more direct answer."

Mr Fabian showed me the placard that he used along highways.

It was about four feet by two and a half. The words "Fabian" and "Assembly" were in heavy black print, six inches high. The other words were in print one-third this high. He determined the size print by actual test in a motor car. "When I drove by going forty I could read the entire sign. When I went sixty I could still read 'Fabian—Assembly.' That was my message to the voters.

"Once when I was heckled I made a nifty answer and won votes. My opponent was then a member of the legislature. At one speech a man got up and shouted, 'I am going to vote for X (my opponent).' Everybody looked at the heckler and then at me. I said, 'My friend, what is your occupation?' He answered, 'Trucker.' I then asked if X had done anything for the truckers. He said, 'You bet he has!' I said, 'Fine, you vote for him. You should vote for the man that does something for you. But if X has not done anything for the rest of you people—vote for me.' "

Although Henry is only twenty-four, he is a natural politician; he understands the human heart in the small town. One night he gave a speech on his candidacy for the state Assembly—the candidates for the other county offices were to follow him with their speeches, but Henry didn't want to hear these talks again. He happened to remember that his mother had recently been slightly hurt. He brushed an imaginary tear from his eye, and in a husky voice said to the small-town audience. "I would like to stay—my mother got hurt. I must go to her—there are only the two of us left." A pause, and then, "Well I carried this town and it was the home town of my opponent."

Part of the above remarks were told to me personally by Mr Fabian, and part are excerpts from his long letter. Other parts of the letter follow:

"My first official action after the election, I hate to confess, was to fall asleep. However, I can be excused, for I had been without sleep for fifty-seven hours prior to that time. Anyone who claims that politics is an easy game just doesn't know what he is talking about. The strain of the campaign is bad enough, but during a close race, when the lead switches back and forth all evening, a candidate feels like a condemned man who is waiting to see if his last-minute reprieve has been granted. The candidate sees a certain precinct go against him, and he curses himself for not taking that extra afternoon to work there; or he sees a conceded 'lost' precinct go for him—and he wonders who or what made the voters

change their views towards him. I know, because I had such a close race, and had that happen to me in five separate precincts. Two went against me and three went for me when I had them picked to go just the opposite.

"I attended 43 chicken, one chili, and one potato pancake suppers—at a cost varying from 35 cents to fifty cents per ticket, and I bought two tickets for each supper. As I am not married, I took many different people with me to these suppers. At a church supper in a German community, I would always have someone with me who could speak German. In a community where the mayor of my home city was well acquainted, I'd take him along, while in the one Polish community, I took along a fellow who had been a pastor of a Polish church for years—though now retired.

"I also went to 18 church picnics during the warm Sundays of August and September. I received personal invitations to 13 of these picnics—and at about ten of them I was asked to give a bingo present—and then I had to spend fifty cents or so trying to win it back. Twice during the campaign I won playing bingo, and both times I looked for the cutest child at the bingo table, and let them choose a present for themselves. This got a nice hand from the other players, for they like a fellow who likes children. I met many fine people at the church suppers and picnics.

"Next, I had the tavern problem. If I had gone into every tavern in my district to put up one of my cards, it would have cost me at least $150.00 to do that—for precedent has it that a candidate must buy a round of drinks for all the boys in the tavern when he puts up one of his cards. So I sent my campaign manager into the taverns to post the cards—and he would buy only the bartender a drink. There was no objection from the fellows in the taverns, and my method cost only $38.00—including the rounds of drinks I bought whenever I stepped into a tavern. My methods seem far the best, for my campaign manager could boast about me—saying things I could not say about myself without labeling myself as 'stuck-up.' However, my campaign manager would always call me if he got into an argument with a SOBER fellow who objected to my candidacy. I welcomed such arguments, and I would go into the tavern and straighten out the objection the fellow had against me. By doing that, I gained a lot of votes, and a lot of respect from people—also a reputation as a 'fighting' type of legislator who wasn't afraid of facing people who disagreed.

"My philosophy of politics is to pin down 'soreheads' and 'objectors' before they get a chance to do some harm. You'd be surprised how 'soreheads' will warm up to you when you show them that you aren't afraid to face them. Some of my most ardent boosters were fellows I converted during the primary campaign. People are less likely to repeat untrue stories if they know that they are sure to have to face you and prove their statements at an early date. I always made it a point to be friendly as the dickens with these people I had to step on, and I gained a lot of votes that way.

"As to unusual methods of campaigning, there is one which I believe I originated, and that is the showing of free talking pictures at a political rally. I originated the idea in my section of the state, at least, two years ago. I watched our opponents putting on free dances, and I noticed that all they got to their dances were members of their own party and many youths too young to vote. I hit upon the method of talking movies—a complete show from comedy to western feature—and we got every person in the community from grandpa to grandchild. When you get the people from the other parties to your meetings, you can convert them, and that is what we did. We showed a first run western feature, a Mickey Mouse, a news reel, a Major Bowes short reel, and a short feature on fishing. We talked and introduced our county candidates while the operator was changing the reels on his portable movie machine. Crowds of from 800 to 1,200 were not unusual. We used newspaper advertising, and handbills which we passed out at country school-houses to get our movie announcement to the people in the vicinity. We showed in every township, usually at the town hall, and in every village and city in the county. If we had advertised in the two large cities, we would have had crowds of from 3 to 5 thousand people at the meetings—and as there isn't a hall that large in the county, we just had to forget about one giant mass meeting. So we showed our movies at the various church and club meetings in the large cities.

"I challenged my opponent to debate his record before any Republican group in the county—but he continually refused. I would have made votes had he accepted, because those votes were potentially his before the debate—and I would have swung some of them, I'm sure.

"Well, that's about all, except that this shall be the first step in a long political career—or so I hope. I have little to offer

outside of being a fighter. I was born on the 'wrong side of the tracks' and I have a solemn regard for the problems of those who live 'off of Park Avenue.' It is this group, which makes up 98% of our American population, that I aim to serve, and serve well."

The next letter is from an attractive-looking young attorney, well built and of medium stature with a full roundish face, pink cheeks, dark eyes that smile and sparkle, and a good head of slick black hair. Although Shakespeare might ask "What's in a name?" Theodore Guarda knows that his name is a vote-getter among his Italian, Polish, and French constituents. For the Poles think he is Polish, the French-Canadians in one small town believe that he is French, and the Italians know that he is Italian. He is of Italian descent, and he is unmarried. This fact is important too. Once I introduced Mr Guarda to a group of young men and women. He was accompanied by his university girl friend. I mentioned her presence when I presented Ted Guarda to the group. Weeks later he said, "Professor Salter, you should not have mentioned my fiancée, for if those girls had been in my district I would have lost their votes. I never take my girl friend back home. There I make an effort to go out with a number of influential daughters. There was one town chairman that was on the fence. I took his daughter out several times. After the election this chairman said, 'Now you will have time to take care of your social engagements.' " Young Mr Guarda thinks of many angles in approaching the voter. He was absorbed with the details of politics in his small home community long before he was old enough to vote. His letter speaks for itself.

"It would take pages to write all about the last campaign, but I intend to give you some of the things I went through.

"As you know, I finished Law School in June. My parents came to the Commencement exercises, and then wanted to go on a week's vacation in Southern Illinois. I refused and came home to start working for my election, knowing that I have been absent from the district for five years. I couldn't afford to remain away from the voters.

"My first job was to contact leaders in different localities. These might be called 'friendship' visits rather than purely political visits. I saw to it that the subject finally came around to politics and usually I asked for advice, flattering them with the idea that they were political 'big-shots.'

"It was also necessary that I open up a law office somewhere in the district. Being more unknown in the eastern end of the district, I set up my office at the county seat of Watonga County. Incidentally there is an opportunity there for a young lawyer. Setting up my office there probably did more for my election than any one thing. I saw to it that I spoke to the Rotary Club in July. Also [I] joined the Watonga County Agricultural Association, and saw to it that I was speaker of the day at their 4th of July celebration.

"As things turned out I did not have opposition in the primary election. The fellow intending to run failed to file his nomination papers on the last day. However, that didn't stop me from carrying on my campaign. My tactics had to be changed from my original plans to some new method. My usual speaking engagements were kept up, personal contacts kept up, and the search for publicity had to be kept up. Since I had no opposition in the primary, interest in the primary would naturally lag. It shifted to the Republican candidates that were running for assembly. There were four candidates expecting the presidential year to sweep the Republican nominee into the assembly.

"My first job was to see that I got a large complimentary vote in the primary. The psychology of a large vote makes many doubtful voters jump on the bandwagon. This was the attitude of the state Republicans in cluttering their county tickets with numerous candidates. As it turned out, I led the county ticket in the total vote cast in the primary.

"My second job was to lay the seeds of discontent among the four Republican candidates seeking the nomination and to see that the weakest candidate was nominated. In other words I and my workers were to act as 'fifth columnists' among these candidates. This was highly successful because after the primary the three defeated candidates had nothing but contempt for the winner of the nomination. Stories of the 'dirty' tactics of one candidate was always brought to the attention of the others. The winner of the Republican nomination could not now ask for active support from the defeated candidates.

"During the campaign I performed numerous favors. Spoke to groups whenever I could. Drank with the fellows, was a 'good sport' and attended picnics of every ilk.

"One of the biggest boons to my election was a court case in the October term of circuit court in Watonga County. I had as

yet not won my spurs as a lawyer. It so happened that a young negro redcap, who was working in Three Oaks as a baggage smasher for the summer tourist season, was accused and indicted of breaking and entering the depot with intent to commit a felony—larceny. The negro was penniless and because of the fact that he was a negro it was merely a question of time before he would be sent to the State prison. The evidence against him was damaging. He was found with his hand in the cash drawer and other circumstances pointed to his guilt. Finally, after debating with myself for some time, and against the advice of other lawyers, I offered my services to him.

"I need not relate all the legal proceedings but I stayed up two days and two nights preparing for the day of trial. Only two terms of circuit court are held in Norski County—one in spring and one in fall. Naturally the county's interest in the term of court is very high, and especially in this case. (I saw to it that interest was created.) On the opening day of term, which was the day of the trial, the court-room was packed and the 36 jurors were impanelled. They came from all over the county. (Incidentally, I saw to it that the case was the first because then the interest was at its peak. The term of court lasts about a week and the last few days are unnoticed.) I do not insinuate that the interests of my client were in any way being jeopardized by my own interest. I was gambling my reputation as a lawyer. If I delivered the goods, my ability would be unquestioned and my youthfulness would be forgotten. If I lost, it would take time before I again could climb the ladder. The trial lasted all day, and I might add that the 23-year-old lawyer was as much on trial as the 23-year-old negro client. I put all my heart and soul in this payless trial and in my final plea to the jury, without sounding egotistical, I do not think that Clarence Darrow could have waxed more eloquently. The jury returned a verdict of *not guilty*. The district attorney's jaw dropped to his stomach. He was up for re-election. Incidentally he was not re-elected after being re-elected five consecutive times. The case won 200 to 500 votes for me. The D.A. lost that many, which spelled defeat for him by a comparative newcomer. The rumor that the negro was freed by Guarda, the young lawyer, spread throughout the county. After that in my visit around the county I found all kinds of people asking me about the case. I had won my spurs as a lawyer and won my election. It was no longer Guarda the Kid, but Guarda the Lawyer, and a good one at that.

"There were other incidents like the type I mentioned to you, but I need not bore you by reiterating them again. I will be in Madison again and at that time I will tell you some of my post-election campaigning incidents. I have already started campaigning for my next election and elections to come."

IV

And so end these letters, a few from many.

My own conclusion as already given in my recent book, *The Pattern of Politics*, is that "The Voter sets the standard and the Politician comes up to it." The voter calls the turn—and this is true regardless of whether the candidate is a university man[2] or one who finished his formal schooling in the third grade. When we examine this voter—either in the 10th ward of Philadelphia or in the small town of Arrowhead in Wisconsin, we find that he likes personal attention—and he likes lots of it. However, the 10th ward voter today is concerned with something beyond the confines of his own neighbourhood. He is apt to have seen the recent election contest as a titanic world-shaking struggle between Roosevelt and Hitler, or he might have seen it as two rival business firms each offering its wares for the voters' approval—and the goods and benefactions to come from the Roosevelt Administration dwarfed the personal services of the Republican ward politicians. In fact, the ballot was so meaningful to people in the poorest districts—as well as in other districts—that they voluntarily marched to the polls under their own power. There is a greater lag in rural and semi-rural sections, and the voters, as I have shown, tend to be more conservative.

A lot of people at last have a positive opinion about the kind of government that they want at Washington. For this reason party affiliations mean less today than ever before; and party organizations, although powerful in primaries, count for less in elections than formerly. This follows as the night the day. If a principle or issue or compelling idea confronts the voter, he will respond, and without being told to. It is only when the point of the election is non-existent or hidden that the organization is all-powerful.

[2]If I may be permitted an opinion, I would say that in campaigning for public office, a candidate does what he must do in order to win, yet when he is once elected to the legislature, for example, the majority of university men probably serve the public more effectively than do a majority of non-university men. This is not true in every case, there are many exceptions, but, by and large, I think it is true. My observation of Fabian and Guarda since their induction into office supports this view.

ANATOLE FRANCE AND HIS CRITICS

J. S. Will

MYSTERY surrounds us. The attraction of the unknown lures us on. The passion to comprehend is a constant spur. So articles and books on Anatole France have succeeded one another for half a century, in greater profusion than for almost any other contemporary writer, without, be it said, moving the attentive observer as the succession of volumes from the pen of Anatole France himself moved Croiset, the historian of Greek literature, who likened them to doves that rise one after another upwards slowly to the light. But man is not made to understand; and the spiritual portrait of Anatole France which emerges from these treatises—usually self-styled psychological studies—is as incongruous and as unlike the sitter as Quasimodo, king of fools, is unlike a man or as the god that has been created by many dogmas is unlike Him Who moves inscrutable in the garments of life which He has assumed as His habiliments. Speaking not of those like Shakespeare whose fame is established beyond appeal, France said that literary reputations are assured by the most pitiful adventures in which the incoherencies of the pedant play their part as well as the naïve jests of the artist. He added: "How dare anyone recount the life of a man or explain the act of a man? Just imagine such a piece of folly, such a spurious thing being undertaken without a tremor!"

Such emphatic remarks by France are weighted with heavy significance and a kind of prophecy in regard to himself. The pitiful adventures began as soon as the first occasion arose for him to step out of the role of disinterested observer and critic, to mingle with the passionate activities of his fellows. Little did he dream that in bestowing the prestige of his name on the impressionistic style of criticism he was fashioning a scourge for his own castigation. It is one thing, however, for Anatole France to create a style for a weekly column in a great daily newspaper by recounting the excitements he experiences as he reads the masterpieces of literature and quite another for one less sensitive and of lesser intellectual breadth to imitate the method of the master in what purports to be a carefully considered account of a great novelist and his work. The unrecognizable features of the composite

portrait, above referred to, result in large measure from the tacit assumption in every considerable volume on Anatole France that a work of art is what the reader feels it to be and not what the author intended him to feel it to be. This is the heart of impressionism and has been the vice of criticism for a generation. "One has the feeling," "I opine," "It seems to me," "probably," are literally or figuratively the trade-marks of the impressionist. Each critic takes, then, out of the book he reads only what he puts into it and the author disappears in chaos and futility. Very few men combine the sensitiveness of the artist with immense knowledge and perspicacity as did France. In these circumstances the recourse to cumbrous "learned" apparatus which is intended to simplify by furnishing more complete material for criticism is mere dust in the eyes, complicating the difficulties and emphasizing the distortion.

For the last forty years of his life Anatole France was easily the most notable figure in the world of letters. As a popular idol only Hugo and Voltaire have rivalled him, each in his day. Latterly there were belittling voices but these were scarcely heard in the general chorus of praise. Before his death he issued what he called his Complete Works. From this collection he omitted a great number of articles, contributed to various journals from 1867 to 1893, which he had never published in book-form. For thirty years these non-essentials have naturally proved a fertile area for those who, justifiably or otherwise, have the itch for the *inédit*. But it is safe to say that France knew what he was doing, and it is also safe to say that, in this case, the *inédit* has added nothing substantive as matter or as manner to the *Œuvres complètes*. There is nothing in the documents excluded by the author from his "definitive edition" that is not better presented in the latter, provided always that methods of interpretation are sound.

As yet a complete literary treatment of France does not exist. Vast numbers of reviews on individual books, large numbers of pamphlets on his ideas and opinions, memoirs of personal relations, critical biographies like those of May and Shanks in English, Carias and Seillière in French, psychological studies by Michaut, Giraud, Cerf, Stewart, Dargan, studies in special aspects such as his art (Truc), his opinions (Roujon), his literary criticism (Antoniu), his irony (Chevalier), his conception of woman (Lahy-

Hollebecque), his likeness to Racine (des Hons), constitute a formidable France library.[1]

The first three in this list are appreciations by men who have a profound admiration for their subject and write not as blind partisans, but as devoted friends who have not forfeited their right to censure. Their artistic taste guides them to unusual penetration and understanding. Carias is the official historian of Anatole France and editor of the great annotated and illustrated edition of his works. He has much more information at his hand than others and is, in consequence, more accurate in details. From time to time his work gleams with *aperçus*, but his brevity, if nothing else, leaves these undeveloped, so that the reader is inclined to discount their significance, the more so that they are sporadic and ill-defined. Truc's series of essays belongs essentially to the same order of studies, less factual, less analytical, more philosophical. To Giraud's intransigent conservatism—he takes pains to reveal his own political attachments, evidently fearing the contagion of France the anarchist or the communist or worse—the ideas of France are extremely antipathetic. After a seriously incompetent discussion of France's novels Giraud is willing to accord him the highest rank in charm and style, which seems not only a *non sequitur* but a contradiction. In Stewart one finds excellent discussions of the Dreyfus Affair, of the Disestablishment, and of Socialism, which provide a most unsatisfactory background for the Parisian who lived largely in antiquity and in modern scenes other than those of the Third Republic. Cerf goes further than any of the others in denying to France all the virtues, literary, philosophical, or personal, and finally hurls him over the walls of Jerusalem into the Gehenna of degenerate artists and other rubbish. Mr Cerf's detestation has the beauty of a natural phenomenon. Michaut's admirably sustained analysis is really worthy of a less vulnerable thesis. It destroys itself by its tendentious emphasis. Antoniu and Chevalier, the former in the confined area of France's literary criticism, the latter in that of irony, skirt the truth at moments so closely that one holds his breath expectantly, only to watch both miss their goal by a hair's breadth through faulty method. Subservience to the printed word, to what is often miscalled authority, but is in reality only the superstition of print,

[1]For the titles of these and other works see the Bibliographical Note at the end of the article.

combined with a mistrust of their own observation and judgment —the latter actually recorded as if protestingly in foot-notes but not employed in the text—these together count for much in their failure. Thus dissertations, whose worth lies in their originality, lose the essence of their originality, not through the fault of the author but because of what might be called the typographical nominalism of the degraded "scholasticism" of our day which tries to insist upon the reign of universal suffrage in the intellectual world. Lahy-Hollebecque's volume on France's women is a purely descriptive discussion without any indication of the significance of the role of woman in the rather static relations she occupies in the course of *contes philosophiques*. The two volumes by Seillière form the most solid body of criticism on France's work, but this criticism is strangely uneven and thwarted through a kind of artistic incomprehension, as seems always to be the case with this exceedingly industrious but unaesthetic Zoilus when he discusses a work of art. The peculiar merit of the encyclopaedic compilation by Dargan is to have summarized the actual state of Francian studies in three fields, namely, (1) the source-material for certain of the novels, (2) what has been said by almost everybody about France and his work, (3) the articles, prior to about 1890, which the author himself had excluded as superfluous from his *Œuvres complètes*, much the larger part of which had been utilized already by Michaut and Antoniu.

The desired literary treatment, then, does not yet exist. It is true that several of the aforementioned works treat of the question of style. But until a full literary study is before us, the validity of all other treatments, biographical as well as philosophical, must remain in question. Nor are the important problems, either, quite those suggested by Mr Dargan: "Who was Grand'maman Nozière? When did A. F. set up a bachelor establishment? What were the circumstances surrounding the divorce?" However entrancing the more personal of these "*cruces*" may seem to a certain "erudition," they may hardly be called serious problems. As for Grand'maman Nozière it is tolerably evident that, like Rosette of *Mademoiselle de Maupin* and Quasimodo of *Notre Dame de Paris*, she has no physical counterpart but represents the spirit of an epoch. Again arises seriously the point of method as of prime importance. Let us, then, by following questions of method indicate some aspects of the fundamental failure of the bulk of this criticism.

There would appear to be a certain impertinence or, at least, naïveté in the suggestion that, before conclusions are formed and judgment passed on the mind and heart of any author, the least we can ask of the critic, in a case like this, is that he should have read in their entirety what the author himself presents as his Complete Works. But the impertinence is only apparent. The rarest of philosophic minds may venture a guess from a partial examination but their conclusions will be at best hazardous deductions, and what critic is prepared to make good his claim to such a mind? The great scholar Lanson wrote an article on the "talent" of France in 1896. Thirty years later he had not modified the substance of his earlier conclusions. His association of greatness of art with nullity of thought seems, however, a heresy, and untenable whether in Lanson or in Giraud. There was clear reason for correcting the conclusions in 1896, and much clearer reason in 1926 since the production of Anatole France had been so great between those dates. Lanson's idea of the dilettantism of France was adopted and elaborated by Michaut in 1913. At least two volumes had been added by France before the publication of the fifth edition of Michaut's work in 1922, but these made no alteration in Michaut's preconceived opinion. Giraud's work of 1913 was republished twenty-two years later. M. Giraud did not forget altogether that between these two editions had appeared *La Révolte des anges*, *Le petit Pierre*, and *La Vie en fleur*. But he calls the first "unreadable" and lumps all three together as *senilia*, these two remarks, in as many lines, constituting his whole discussion of what Seillière and others recognize as "a highly important, ingenious and skilful" performance and a striking development of some of France's ideas. It seems fair to say that if M. Giraud had really understood *La Révolte des anges*, one of the three volumes of *senilia* that appeared before France's death in 1924, the whole spirit of his attack on France would have lost its *raison d'être*. Finally, Dargan closes his rambling volume of summaries, life-details and impressions at the Lanson year of 1896, because "by then the man and the mask he wore had been thoroughly fashioned," and apparently in at least partial accord with the implied conclusions of Lanson. Now, between his fiftieth and eightieth years France wrote the great majority of his masterpieces, including the *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc*, the only one of them specially noticed by Lanson. Beyond a doubt the really critical examination of these

works would, among other things, have cancelled some of the five periods into which Dargan divides the harassed life of his subject, revealed the fundamental unity in his thought, and unveiled a majestic arch spanning the years from 1866 to 1922. It happens also that unpublished material after 1896 is very rare except for letters and these are of difficult accessibility.

Inexact reading presents even more crucial difficulties than partial reading. Charity suggests that, in compilations, errors are frequently due to the incompetence of assistants. On this subject it is impossible to enter into great detail. Take, however, the seemingly trifling case of the salamander and the sylph in the *Rôtisserie de la reine pédauque*. D'Astarac's salamanders and sylphs cause Dargan almost as much trouble to interpret as they gave d'Astarac. Jahel was not a salamander but a sylph and such a confusion interferes with the interpretation of three of the four principal characters in the book, Jahel, d'Astarac, and Tournebroche. Jahel fulfilled her function and brought to Tournebroche through suffering exactly what the solitude and pain of the jail brought to Jean Servien, not "disaster" but salvation. For the same reasons we point out that the gnomes in *Abeille* are not supernatural but subhuman, in which fact is to be found the motif of this exquisite tale, which is not "light" but love, light being the radiancy of love. The importance of apparently insignificant details becomes even plainer apropos of Renan and his influence on Anatole France. Dargan says that "the nickname of Mlle Renan applied to France was to some extent justified." But, reading accurately, we find it was not France who was so named. It was Maurice Barrès, and it was France who bestowed the sobriquet on him. "He never demanded that man's thought should be lofty" is another statement by the same critic, in answer to which we might quote endlessly from the work of France or inquire concerning the significance of *élégance* in both his ethic and his aesthetic, and the nature of beauty as "the natural exercise of noble minds." Anatole France used to say we take out of a book what we put into it. That the mind of man is often the home of ignoble thoughts is abundantly apparent from the sly smiles, the innuendos, and the gratuitous slanders in some of these "scholarly" treatises, in reply to which France would remark that such incidents are at once an indication of our human condition and a sign pointing out the road as well as the means to its perfection.

Anatole France disclaimed all right to be called a philosopher but he was capable of exact thought as well as of exact image, and of exact thought even because of exact image. That as an artist he should have been tormented by the possibility of perfection in man—an idea that finds slight place in the elucubrations of any of our critics—and that, as well, he should have displayed a pessimism almost Christian concerning the nature of man, imposes upon him, in the first place, the obligation of exactness in the use of language and upon the reader, in the second place, a like obligation of an exact consciousness of the sense of individual words. Anatole France was keenly sensitive to the values of words and, always seeking simplicity in his style, rarely used them carelessly. Hence the appearance that his expression often wears of forcing the sense of language in both his writing and his conversation. The power of the Logos was at least as sensible in the allegories of Anatole France as in Balzac. Indeed it might be argued that France's thought is built upon the nature of words, the French language by its very genius lending itself to such an intellectual play, the sense image and the abstract idea, nature and spirit, primary and secondary, cohabiting often in one and the same word as feeling and thought in one and the same flesh. In his work *sensuel* may mean sensual or sensuous, *amour* is passion and ideal love, *raison* is reason and reasonableness, *volupté* is voluptuousness and joy (delectation), *science* is science and knowledge, *désir* is fleshly desire and spiritual longing, language being constantly philosophical in its bearing as is the mind of the veritable human being. (Anatole France was not a behaviourist.) The much maligned idea of *art inutile* has the same duality and ambiguity. "Love is to France merely a matter of sensuality," declares Cerf, in spite of France's steady affirmation of "the vanity of every profane desire." Michaut confuses *illusion* and *imagination*, Antoniu *raison* and *intelligence*, Dargan *conscience* as "consciousness" and "conscience." Inattention to this duality of language lurking in the words he uses, represented in his personages from *Les Désirs de Jean Servien* right through to *La Vie en fleur*, and expressed elsewhere with sombre magnificence, stigmatizes him as an Epicurean in the most vulgar sense of the English word and takes no account of the spirituality common to Anatole France and Epicurus.

These matters of complete reading and of accurate reading are

so primary that real boldness is required even to mention them, especially in such a connection as this. But it is just in this connection that the compulsion to mention them is most insistent. There is no man so misrepresented by criticism, no man in the contemporary world of letters who is so clearly a touchstone of criticism, no man in whose connection criticism has shown its weakness more clearly than in his case. A review of the general publications on Anatole France shows that his work has often been read with pleasure, but rarely with understanding. Is there really no relation between pleasure and understanding? Is the law of suffering in no sense a middle term? When France said that he did not write novels, that he wrote *contes philosophiques*, he meant, evidently, that he wished to be understood. But impressionism in the hands of the wrong persons is as sensational and sentimental as the life of Sylvestre Bonnard in whom all of these critics experience the most intense *volupté*. Then they wonder why the creator of that debile old man should have abandoned him and them. France abandoned Bonnard exactly as he had abandoned the thought of Renan many years before.

Now a novel is a microcosm. It is in itself a universe, and it is not read until it becomes in every word and part coherent with itself or, on the other hand, is apprehended as incoherent. As a work of art it obeys its own laws and must be made plain in its own nature and by its own right. To the question how often it must be read that it be thus plain, the answer might be "just as often as you must look on the face of a friend before you clearly understand his nature." We must gaze upon it until it has betrayed itself. We always read with expectancy, an expectancy of excitement or an expectancy that we shall discover our own thought. But for understanding we must read with attention. A sound critical method is no more and no less than serious attention. One might believe that critics, particularly "learned" critics, had entered into a wager that an artist's mind and manner could be revealed, not by attention to his creations but by spying upon his private life, by catching him in undress, by bursting in upon his private and confidential movements, as if this were the guide to the labyrinth, the golden key, instead of being what it is, poor journalism and an assertion of the critic's indigence. The reduction of the artist to the measure of the critic is scarcely the business of sound criticism.

Take the case of Sylvestre Bonnard. What was his crime? Dargan romanticizes his reply: "the rescue of Jeanne from a hateful pension." What is really meant is that the crime is the clandestine removal of Jeanne from the private school and the control of her guardian. Dargan made the same reply twenty years ago and all these critics, but one who is not sure, are of the same opinion. If we accept this account of the legal crime as being the real crime we make Bonnard a contemner of public morals and an anarchist. We make him, besides, a creation of André Gide and a follower of the cult of the *acte gratuit*. But the old paleographer declares that his "intentions were innocent" in this case and that the abduction was no crime. It is only by the serious remonstrances of M. de Gabry that he sees his action as punishable. In due time, however, he knows instinctively the meaning of crime and tells of it with all the effects of melodrama. Cataloguing his library, the sale of which was to provide a dowry for Jeanne, he could not bring himself to part with the most valuable of his books and manuscripts. He concealed them. "So I had made a reserve. It was then I knew the meaning of crime. The temptation came during the night. By dawn it was irresistible—I seized a volume —this jewel, this treasure I had dreamed of all night and I carried it off. It is a terrible thing to tell. I was robbing Jeanne of her dowry and when the crime was consummated I started cataloguing again until. . . ." In this case he does not offend public morals but only the spirit of love. In the one case he acted sentimentally, ignorantly, and generously but in his own eyes not criminally, in the other he acted sentimentally and knowingly but selfishly and sinned against the law of love. This was his crime, the real crime. If we know the real crime we have some knowledge of France's philosophy, of which we get no knowledge if we mistake the legal crime for the real crime. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

In pursuing the question of reading without serious attention and its consequences, we have our choice of books and of incomprehensions, as many of the latter, almost, as of the former. *La Rôtisserie de la reine pédauque? La Révolte des anges?* To choose the latter, who will interpret the angels? No one, although angels are common symbols in France's work. Who has ever referred to the event in French history on which this tale is founded? No one. What is the actual point of the book? you ask. The encouragement

of anarchy, an incitement to revolution, a diatribe against war, are the answers heard when answers are given. To think of Anatole France as a revolutionary is never to have given serious attention to any of his tales, especially to those written after 1896. He was certainly a reformer, but not a revolutionary. The question whether he was for or against the great Revolution is as pointless as whether he was for or against love in the *Lys rouge*.

Our critics being sound sentimentalists demand love-stories from France, paying no attention to his declared indifference to that type of literature, and refusing to see the Pierre stories or *Abeille* or others. But, demanding a love-story, they point to the *Histoire comique* or to the *Lys rouge* as the kind of repulsive love-story France could write. The reply is that neither of these is a love-story, nor can they be possibly interpreted as such. The *Lys rouge* is a love-story exactly in the same sense as the *Ile des Pingouins* is history. "Love embellishes," but passion disfigures. The *Histoire comique* is as much of a love-story as the *Odyssey* or *Don Quixote*. It is a pendant to both *Jocaste* and *Thaïs*. For Félicie, the heroine of the *Histoire comique*, has the instinct (a rudimentary desire) for the beautiful but, unlike Thaïs, no desire for knowledge, the co-creator of the beautiful, while Jocaste has no desire at all to guide her to the beautiful either in feeling or in thought. She is merely a suggestible thing. The reproach that stands against the critics of Anatole France from Lanson down, is that of uninstructed impressionism. They are either Evariste Gamelin of the *Dieux ont soif* or Jean Servien of the *Désirs de Jean Servien* but do not go as far as either Gamelin or Servien to test the truth of their experiences.

These extraordinary results, more characteristic of the "scholarly" production than of other criticism, seem to be due to several causes, but principally to lack of sympathy with the author and an inability to transpose symbols. By sympathy is meant, not liking but simply a readiness to learn the author's mind and purpose, to put one's self at the author's point of view. "Is it not just and necessary," wrote Lemaître, "to begin, as far as possible without preconceived ideas, by a sympathetic reading of the works, in order to get at a definition of what they contain that is original and peculiar to the author?" Exactly there lies the weakness. The critic comes to the author with a special purpose, not with detachment. He approaches his task not for the author's sake but

for his own. He is convinced beforehand of what he must find. If he looked back after having finished his work, he would see himself and not his author. This is the weakness of "Science" according to Sir Arthur Eddington, and of both science and sentimentality according to Anatole France. Seillière desires to classify France as either a rational or irrational "Imperialist." Michaut and Antoniu are determined to find a dilettante, Stewart a Parisian. Dargan desires to show that France's divorce from his wife embittered his future life, not at all an original idea but, it would seem, a thoroughly unsound one. Each of them can be caught twisting facts to suit his thesis, bearing heavily on his own rudder, like M. de Laveleye who, having fallen into melancholy because of financial losses, wrote an article to show that Hamlet's sadness had a similar origin. As for the other point, inability to see the significance of the symbols used, Anatole France writes *contes philosophiques*, as he points out. This means that his art is a highly conventionalized art. He must, then, have at least a certain thought-pattern, and to interpret his work we shall have to know this pattern. Then the symbols become alive with meaning. No longer will we interpret the Noah's Ark, the Nuremberg box, the angels, Satan, the gnomes, his irony as if he saw the world through our eyes. Indifference to the author is seen again in the constant tendency on the part of the critic to pass judgment as if the background of thought were identical in author and critic.

Not only is there little or no sympathy between author and critic, the latter seems rarely to see the original or the specially interesting in the former, except in style. France cannot depict character, his plots are poor, his structure non-existent. The critic seems always to be looking backward, the artist forward. The critic hankers for the established, does not see it even if it is there, and the strange is to be condemned, as for example in *La Révolte des anges*. Certain of France's novels are as skilfully constructed as the best of Balzac's, not perhaps as Bourget's. Departure from the Balzac model was deliberate with France, and he explains himself: "There is a unity that is even more solid than that of a cleverly connected plot. It is cohesion of spirit. Episodes are disconnected, but the thought that plays through them is strong and firm. There is an inward radiation which illumines, vitalizes and harmonizes the most various incidents." Moreover, this was already in the tradition of the novel and remains after France

one of the characteristic features of the contemporary novel. France's outstanding characters are no other than himself, charge the critics. It may be. So, in a measure, are Shakespeare's. But Bonnard, Bergeret, Coignard, Gamelin, and many others have their own several identification cards and there is no possibility of confusing their portraits. Not in any case is any one of them actually Anatole France.

The critic, finding it difficult to decipher the symbols of beauty through which the artist expresses his significant ideas, has recourse to the side-paths, the blind trails, the resting-places, the odds and ends, the forgotten articles, the *disjecta membra*, the memory of which the artist had hoped might be buried with him, the things which confuse and do not illuminate. So the thought of Anatole France, it appears, is full of contradictions, of caprices, and of paradoxes. Or his was a nature of an extraordinarily nervous sensibility, whose mind was a compact of mere images without significance because there was no unifying mind. Or again he was a man of ideas who looked on life from many angles and treated many subjects but, having no will to stabilize him, turned from this to that and left gleaming images of a structureless world. So for May and Carias and Shanks and Dargan, France is a disillusioned idealist. For Lanson and Michaut and Antoniu, he is a dilettante. For Stewart he is a citizen of Paris. For Chevalier an ironist. For Truc a phenomenalist. At times the double face of Janus wears a naïve air indeed in comparison with the complicated physiognomy drawn by the critic. One biographer, for example, within fifteen consecutive pages, represents France as an "idealist," a "dilettante," a "sceptic," an "intellectual Epicurean," a "pure hedonist," a "disillusioned idealist," a "romantic Pyrrhonist," a "philosophic nihilist," a "pragmatist," and a "humanist."

It is hardly possible to admit that we possess here a satisfactory description of the thought of a man who was conceded to be not only the greatest writer of French in his day, and one of the very greatest in the whole history of French letters, but also an intellectual leader of his time. Doubt is also warranted on the surer grounds that no adequate arguments support the attribution of such resonant descriptions. France himself stated that he was a philosophic sceptic, but he added that such scepticism does not change the conditions of life. The charge of dilettantism was based first principally on a flagrant misinterpretation of the banquet

scene in *Thaïs*, coupled with the artistically perverse identification of the author with the personage Nicias. The critics failed to see that it is Thaïs herself who represents the thought of the author, and not Nicias. In its turn the banquet scene was read as the brilliant performance of an intellectual juggler who made the fragile bubbles of philosophic theories collide and burst in mid-air, pricked mysteriously and with infernal cleverness by the performer, as an exhibition of virtuosity. Thus the scene was lifted quite out of the framework of the novel in which its real function is to show the discordant philosophies of Alexandria uniting in the praise of beauty and conferring on the intuitive movement of the common people a sort of intellectual validation by acclaiming Thaïs as the reincarnation of the eternal principle of beauty and its living symbol. A dilettante, Anatole France? He who erected his eternal "Nay" against contemporary Naturalism and pointed an accusing finger straight at the modern conceptions of law, justice, politics, money, society, the state, and individual living?

Is it the opiate of his incomparable style that keeps the readers of Anatole France from penetrating beyond the playfulness, the picturesqueness, the lucidity and the Circean music of his phrase, to the meaning of this accumulated witchery? Or is it that, being rank realists and hollow men, we admire and enjoy only the realism of the hollow man, those features in art which resemble our own? On any other basis it is difficult to explain why Sylvestre Bonnard should be so commonly regarded as the high point of France's achievement, his ideal man, the man his creator wished to be. For, certainly, Bonnard is one of the characters whose hollowness France has taken great pains to depict. Bonnard is unseeing, unimaginative and selfish. His egotism, his intolerance of the slightest discomfort, to say nothing of suffering, is the very spirit of his "crime," whereas, for his creator, suffering is "the corner stone of life," "without which no serious or profound beauty is possible, and on which all the virtues have been built." It is on the basis of this personage and, again, his imputed identity with the author, that the latter is described as a "disillusioned idealist." Now, Bonnard is not an idealist, nor is Anatole France, either in the metaphysical or the vulgar sense of the word, and while Bonnard is certainly disillusioned Anatole France is not. The framework of the universe on which *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard* was built is the framework of France's earliest work as it was that of his latest.

Bonnard was of portentous simplicity. He resembles the scholar who makes books out of the opinions of other men. He was incapable of translating either his scientific knowledge or his sentiment into terms of living, and this alone "can furnish a safe basis for the elevation of the individual to an aesthetic apprehension of the world." Just as the fair picture of man is defaced in Dechartre (*Le Lys rouge*) and in Félicie Nanteuil (*Histoire comique*), or that of national life (*Ile des Pingouins*) by the unrestrained turbulence of passion, or in Gamelin (*Les Dieux ont soif*) by the devastating aberrations of abstract reasoning, or in Paphnuce (*Thaïs*) by pride of intellect, so in the paleographer Bonnard the scientific method has failed to produce a full man, for Bonnard's love of nature is as insufficient to perfect him as the love of art in Dechartre, and he loses himself in fantasies, in subjective caprice and in puerility.

To embellish life, and to depict or suggest (negatively, if need be, as in *Le Lys rouge* and *L'Ile des Pingouins*) the fulness of life, is the business of art according to the theory and practice of Anatole France, and it is clear that these two are inseparable in his thinking. Fulness of life is the beauty (and goodness) of life and the beauty (and goodness) of life is its fulness. Absence of beauty is positive evil. To be whole, man must have laid hold on the infinite mystery, on "that something which, having no body, has no name, and without which no spiritual enterprise could ever be undertaken." This mystery, towards which we strain in our emotions and our wills, which is revealed to us by a love which triumphs over the flesh, defined by a knowledge which is refined by criticism into understanding and purified by a suffering which leads to detachment from the vulgar idea of happiness but creates joy and peace, this is the quality of life, the permanent good, the ineffable vision, what Anatole France calls Beauty, divinity made visible, God Whom he may hardly name. The final reference for France was never to system or to dogma, which is the work of abstraction, but to the individual in whom the sense of beauty is innate. The responsibility rests with the individual to choose the means of his perfection. "I have inquired concerning the way of all those who, whether priests, savants, magicians or philosophers, claim to know the geography of the Unknown. Not one was able to point out to me the right road. . . . The feeling for the beautiful is my guide. Who is sure of having found a better?" In this faith Anatole France lived and died. His faith may be open to criticism. In any case

he had reached it before he wrote his first novel. He retained it and practised it to the end. By the end he had lived long enough to survey the life of man in four great cycles, the individual in relation to Beauty, the nation in relation to Beauty, civilizations in relation to Beauty, and Beauty in the cosmos.

The judgment of life by the standard of beauty is not an unusual nor an empty pastime for a poet. It was France's way of revealing the eternal values available to every well-born human being who has the grace to nurture the light that was born with him, turning his back on rationalisms and romanticisms. These are the human grounds of his work and are our warrant for calling him a radical humanist in opposition to pseudo-humanisms such as "scientific" and "sociological" and what not. In metaphysical terms perhaps the category of critical realism is hospitable enough to include him.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

ANTONIU, A.: *Anatole France, critique littéraire*, Paris, 1929.

CARIAS, L.: *Anatole France*, Paris, 1931.

CERF, B.: *Anatole France: The Degeneration of a Great Artist*, New York, 1926.

CHEVALIER, H.: *The Ironic Temper: Anatole France and his Time*, New York, 1932.

DARGAN, E. P.: *Anatole France, 1844-1896*, New York, 1937.

DES HONS, G.: *Anatole France et Racine*, Paris, 1927.

GIRAUD, V.: *Anatole France*, Paris, 1935.

LAHY-HOLLEBECQUE, M.: *Anatole France et la femme*, Paris, 1924.

LANSON, G.: *Pages choisies d'Anatole France* ("Notice"), Paris, 1897.

————: *Histoire de la littérature française*, vingt et unième édition, Paris, 1929.

MAY, J. L.: *Anatole France, the Man and His Work*, London, 1924.

MICHAUT, A. F.: *Anatole France*, cinquième édition, Paris, 1922.

ROUJON, J.: *La Vie et les opinions d'Anatole France*, Paris, 1925.

SEILLIÈRE, E.: *La Jeunesse d'Anatole France*, Paris, 1934.

————: *Anatole France, critique de son temps*, Paris, 1934.

SHANKS, L. P.: *Anatole France: The Mind and the Man*, New York, 1932.

STEWART, H. L.: *Anatole France, the Parisian*, New York, 1927.

TRUC, G.: *Anatole France, l'artiste et le penseur*, Paris, 1924.

THE WAR AND OPINION

I. THE DEFENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN* — EDGAR MCINNIS

IF there is one lesson which each successive operation in the present war has served to emphasize, it is the supreme importance of air power. In every successful invasion, from Poland to Crete, air supremacy has been basic to the German success. In the single Nazi failure—the assault on Britain last autumn—air power was the essential obstacle which the Nazis failed to overcome. And if the attempt is renewed, it is on the basis of air superiority that the issue will be decided.

From the point of view of defence, this means the continued ascendancy of the fighter squadrons. So long as they command the air over Britain, a German landing in any substantial force is so hazardous that it would be tried only in desperation. Their ascendancy makes it possible for the defending bombers to strike at the German concentrations and to disrupt any efforts at a landing by sea. But if the fighters are overcome, the bombers are likely to be reduced to comparative ineffectiveness, and even the command of the narrow seas may at the critical moment be lost to the invader.

There is, however, a further lesson that has been powerfully reinforced by recent operations. A defending air force can be overcome elsewhere than in the air itself. One way to beat the fighters is to knock them out of the skies. But equally effective, and in certain circumstances quicker as well as more decisive, is the destruction of their bases. Direct air attack is one method; but another—which we have seen operating only too effectively—is the type of ground attack which was so decisive in Crete.

Against this type of attack, even the ascendancy of the defending fighters is no absolute guarantee. If the bomber can get through, so can the parachutist. Air attack may thus be used to launch ground operations, in which the preliminary foothold gained by the parachutists may be reinforced from troop-carrying planes. Against this form of assault, which aims at destroying air power from the ground, air power must depend on the effective operation of its supporting ground troops for its salvation.

**The Battle of Britain: An Air Ministry Account of the Great Days from 8th August–31st October 1940*, Toronto, Queen's Canadian Fund, 1941, 10c.
Can Britain Be Invaded? by "Strategicus," London, Dent, 1941, 25c.

This is one of the situations discussed in the brief and stimulating book on the possibilities of invasion by "Strategicus," the military expert of the *Spectator*. It was, of course, written before Crete provided a demonstration of the first air-borne invasion, but it is doubtful whether this episode would bring any major change in the author's conclusions. The method itself was foreshadowed by operations in Norway and Holland, and it has long been assumed —as Mr Carver's article amply shows—that it would be tried in England as well. The invader's ability to land a limited number of troops is fully accepted, but the expectation has always been that the land forces will be able to deal with them promptly and effectively.

It is particularly on this expectation that the operations in Crete have a real bearing. The assumption of "Strategicus" that a sea-borne invasion is necessary for actual conquest may be generally accepted. So may his judgment that "a successful invasion in the face of an unbeaten air force would be impossible." What may, however, need fuller consideration, in view of recent events, is the possibility of a small body of air-borne troops contributing to that defeat by the damage it might inflict on the bases and communications upon which air power depends.

For if the R.A.F. should falter, it is more than doubtful whether the navy could hold the channel against an invader. Germany, striking from a wide variety of directions, could force the dispersal of British naval strength by a series of strong feints before the main thrust was launched. Air reconnaissance would detect the preparations, but it is by no means sure that it could tell where or when the real blow would fall. And if invasion were covered in its full transit by a strong bomber force, the navy could meet it only if the ships had the protection of British fighter planes. In such a case even the general supremacy of the R.A.F. would not be enough. It must prevent the enemy from gaining even temporary and local supremacy, not only over England but over the surrounding seas as well, if England is to be fully secure.

The moral is again one that has been constantly emphasized by the course of the present war. It is the vital need for strength and co-ordination in all arms. In this co-ordination, air power is the first essential. But there are limits to what it can accomplish by itself. And if Germany cannot defeat the R.A.F. by a direct

challenge in the air, we may be sure that she will seek out other devices for which our other arms must be prepared.

We have reason for growing confidence in the adequacy of these preparations. The difficulties from the German side, as outlined by "Strategicus," have not diminished, and the strength of the defending force has steadily increased. Even taking full account of the lessons of Crete, it would certainly be difficult to repeat such methods in the face of the highly organized defensive system in England and of the mobile armoured forces available there. There is no absolute security, for some forces could certainly be landed, and while that is true some risk must remain. But apart from major miscalculations or ineptitude, it is highly unlikely that enough forces could gain a foothold to make possible a sea landing or to wreck the air force from the ground.

We have even less reason to fear the defeat of the R.A.F. in the air. Its strength is certainly not inferior to that of last autumn when it maintained itself so decisively against the Nazi assault. A new and still greater assault may yet be attempted, for Goering has still to throw the full weight of the *Luftwaffe* against the British Isles. He must risk this if an invasion is to be attempted, but there is every reason to expect that his next attempt will fail as completely as his last.

The story of that failure is brilliantly told in the account published for the Air Ministry by the Ministry of Information. It combines an admirable compactness in the presentation of facts with the vividness of description and swiftness of narrative that is to be expected from a well-known writer of thrillers. It is possible at last to get a clear idea of the forces engaged, the shifting objectives of the German attack, and the methods by which a defending force that was constantly outnumbered succeeded in inflicting a decisive defeat which changed the whole course of the war.

There can be little doubt that the air attack was intended as a prelude to invasion. Even if Germany did not throw in her full strength, her efforts were on far too great a scale to be regarded as limited in their purposes. The aim was complete air ascendancy. If that had been achieved, invasion would surely have followed, with very considerable prospect of success. The crux of the battle was the month-long assault on London whose climax was the terrific day of September 15. It has been suggested in some quarters

that Hitler then had victory almost within his grasp. This account gives little evidence to support such a view. On the contrary, the effectiveness of the defenders showed a steady increase, leading in October to the practical abandonment of mass daylight assaults. With the resort to night bombing came an end to the German hope of a swift victory and a retreat to the methods of attrition implicit in night bombing.

We need not underestimate the seriousness of the results which German night bombing has since achieved. But however shocking they may be, their true significance is to be measured by the extent to which they fall short of the German goal and the increasing note of wishful thinking in German pronouncements. Last April, for instance, Field Marshal Kesserling wrote: "I regard the purpose of the *Luftwaffe* in a total war by its very nature to have been achieved when lands are attacked, power centres annihilated, and the capacity of the people to resist smashed, so that occupation can follow more or less without a fight." That is very far from the arrogant directness of purpose which marked the air assault of last autumn. It is also a prospect which even the attacks of the past nine months have brought very little nearer. Indeed, the pronouncement of the more realistic General Kabisch last November still seems to be the last word. "The German people indulge in the optimistic view that the war can be won by the *Luftwaffe*. The fact remains that the only way to win is by getting troops into England." On that basis we have good reason to look forward with sober confidence to the ultimate outcome.

II. BRITAIN'S HOME GUARD

P. L. CARVER

WHEN the history of the present war comes to be written the Home Guard will deserve at least a separate chapter. It may deserve very much more if it should have been actively engaged in military operations; but it will not be so engaged, according to present arrangements, unless the Germans should effect a landing in Great Britain. That, at the time of writing, seems highly improbable. "Here in London," said Mr Churchill, "we are still waiting for the long promised invasion. So are the fishes."

It could be argued that one of the more superficial reasons why the Germans will lose the war is that their capacity for thorough,

laborious, ant-like organization is surpassed by the British capacity for improvisation to meet an emergency. Until the capitulation of France everything had gone, in the characteristic phrase originally invented by the German High Command, "according to plan." Since that event it has gradually become apparent that the plan had not allowed for the continuance of the struggle by Great Britain alone. Lord Halifax, who usually weighs his words, has told an audience of American journalists that "Hitler . . . lost the war in June, 1940, when he failed to take advantage of the situation existing after the collapse of France. England was then at her weakest, and Germany might have been able to cash in if she had acted quickly."[1] More recently Mr Churchill has lent his authority to the statement that "Hitler took it more or less for granted when France gave in that we should give in too. We did not give in, and he had to think again."[2] The Germans are not good at thinking again, and their second thoughts were slow and uninspired.

It is common knowledge that the emergency found Great Britain unprepared, and that such preparation as could be made at the moment of crisis might well have proved unavailing if it had been put to the test immediately. According to some observers the public took the danger too lightly, and it is true that there were no obvious signs of excitement except that "invasion stories"[3] superseded "Hitler and Mussolini stories" as the most popular form of humour; but there was real determination beneath the outward levity, and Mr Churchill had no reason to be disappointed with the response to his broadcast speeches. The British, like the Germans, had to think again. Unlike the Germans, who could form new plans at their leisure, they had to think quickly, and to act at the same time; or, when that was impossible, to act first and think afterwards. The Home Guard, as it is now called, was one of a number of innovations which scrambled into existence almost imperceptibly, and have already, in a few months, adapted

[1] *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 27, 1941.

[2] Speech broadcast on Feb. 9, 1941.

[3] One of these stories, alleged to be true, and typical of dozens, may be offered as a specimen. A farm-labourer in East Kent enquired why so many soldiers had suddenly appeared in the neighbourhood, and was told that they expected soon to be fighting a battle against a foreign invader. He is said to have replied: "They can't have a battle in this village, because the green isn't big enough and Squire wouldn't lend his park."

themselves to so many changes and developments that their small beginnings are difficult to recognize.

In watching the campaign in Poland, Norway, and the Low Countries, everyone had been impressed by the success with which the Germans had employed small bodies of gangsters and desperadoes, landed by parachute in all sorts of disguises, to wreck the defences of their victims far in advance of the invading armies. In spite of the obvious difficulties it was thought that the experiment might be repeated in this country, and it was suggested that farmers, sportsmen, gamekeepers,[4] and, generally, persons accustomed to the use of firearms, should carry a gun with them in case they should notice a parachutist descending into the back garden. The analogy sometimes quoted was that of the Boer farmers, who for years before the South African War had carried a rifle, for use against a possible invader, while pursuing their ordinary occupations.

This proposal met with very little encouragement. One group of critics raised questions of legality, of which more was heard later; another pointed out the danger that a British pilot who had bailed out as the result of an accident might be mistaken for an enemy; others entertained themselves with horrific visions of a dozen or more Germans, armed with all the most murderous weapons which an aeroplane can carry, being challenged by a breathless Master of Foxhounds flourishing a shot-gun. It is not to be denied that the scheme in its earliest and crudest form deserved much of the ridicule which was poured upon it; but it was not more ridiculous than the alternative sponsored by *The Times* and, for a moment, sanctioned by the government.[5] On May 11, 1940, *The Times* observed in a leading article that "parachuting may be tried in this country," and continued: "Many of our readers . . . have already written to ask what is the correct manner of dealing with these missionaries

[4]It would be true to add poachers, whose deadly aim and exhaustive knowledge of their locality were to find legitimate scope in national defence. I am not sure about professional burglars, but I should not be surprised if some of them were included.

[5]I cannot give chapter and verse, but I remember that about this time a request was broadcast to the public on behalf of the Ministry of Home Security to the effect that anyone seeing an airman descending in his neighbourhood by means of a parachute should report the occurrence to the nearest police station, giving details of the time and place. It was added that the police would, if they thought it advisable, communicate with the military authorities.

of Hitlerism dropping from the sky, if they land in country places. . . . It is the duty of the nearest military command to deal with them. The duty of the civilian is to report what he has seen as accurately as possible to the police." What the "missionaries of Hitlerism" would be doing while he was pondering his report was not for the dutiful civilian to consider; but it would certainly have forced itself upon his attention, however dutiful he might be, when he discovered that the telephone wires had been cut. The police, if ever the report reached them, would encounter the same difficulty when they came to communicate with "the nearest military command."

If this should give an unfavourable impression of the competence of the ruling authorities, it may be reassuring to remember that on the previous day, May 10, Mr Chamberlain had brought his disastrous premiership to an end. On the evening of the fourteenth, Mr Eden, the new Secretary for War, took up the question of aerial invasion in a broadcast to the nation.[6] After describing the purpose and method of attacks by parachute troops, as observed in other countries, he continued:

> We want large numbers of . . . men in Great Britain who are British subjects, between the ages of 17 and 65, to come forward now and offer their services in order to make assurance doubly sure. The name of the new force which is now to be raised will be the "Local Defence Volunteers." This name, Local Defence Volunteers, describes its duties in three words. It must be understood that this is, so to speak, a spare-time job, so there will be no need for any volunteer to abandon his present occupation. . . .
>
> This appeal is directed chiefly to those who live in small towns, villages, and less densely populated suburban areas. I must warn you that, for certain military reasons, there will be some localities where the numbers required will be small, and others where your services will not be required at all. Here, then, is the opportunity for which so many of you have been waiting.

[6]It is probable that Mr Eden was influenced in some degree by a letter addressed to *The Times* by the Duke of Montrose, and appearing on the day of his broadcast. The Duke proposed the formation of a "National Guard," to be composed of volunteers accustomed to the use of a rifle but not likely to be required for military service. "These men might be organised on a 'Commando, basis for regional operations. They would not wear uniform but a simple armlet. They would not receive payment except when on service. . . . Their duty would be to attack, snipe or round up the air soldiers, or parachutists, as quickly as possible, and also to act as guides to any troops that may come to operate in the district." So far as this scheme differs from Mr Eden's, it is a more exact forecast of the form which the Home Guard was to assume by the middle of July, when it first acquired that name.

This broadcast has now passed into history. The response proved that public opinion was moving farther and faster than the government, and perhaps with a clearer vision. General Eastwood, now Inspector-General of the Home Guard, has revealed recently[7] that the War Office had decided upon 150,000 as a liberal estimate of the number of volunteers likely to present themselves. Actually, though Mr Eden's address lasted for less than twenty minutes, the first offers of service were received before he had finished speaking. The next morning there were 250,000; within two days there were a million, and it was not long before a further half-million brought the potential strength of the new force up to ten times the number which Mr Eden had expected.

Though we cannot know what went on behind the scenes, except in so far as the veil may be lifted by such revelations as that of General Eastwood, there is reason to believe that this *embarras de richesse* was viewed with some perplexity. The government was in no hurry to enrol the volunteers, and some districts, growing impatient, took the matter into their own hands and made their own arrangements. This explains some curious facts mentioned without comment in a recent book: "In some areas the officers of the L.D.V. were appointed by the secretary of the golf club. In other places the sergeant in charge of the police station decided the commands and in others the local Vicar took charge."[8] The truth is that there still remain, after centuries of parliamentary government, relics of the old belief in the wisdom of thanes, aldermen, and knights of the shire, and it is natural, at a time of crisis, to turn to a local chieftain rather than wait for the word of command from London. The men of Wessex would have acted in much the

[7] In a broadcast speech on Feb. 7, 1941.

[8] Hugh Slater, *Home Guard for Victory*, p. 12. I have quoted this because it conveys a true impression, but it is not quite accurate as a statement of fact. If ever the local Vicar took charge the case must have been exceptional, as the Archbishop of Canterbury had refused permission to the clergy to join the Local Defence Volunteers in accordance with the rule forbidding them to join a combatant force except as chaplains. The allusion to the choice of "officers" also needs some qualification. It was at first decided that there should be no commissions in the Local Defence Volunteers, and, though this decision was reconsidered at the end of 1940, when the force had assumed greater importance as the Home Guard, the first commissions have only just been granted at the time of writing, with effect from February 1. The "officers" to whom Mr Slater refers would be local organizers who had consented to act provisionally, though most of them would have held commissions in the last war.

same way while waiting for King Alfred to lead them against the Danes.

The government, in the meantime, was taking precautions against infiltrations by a possible Fifth Column. It was not enough to be of British nationality, as Mr Eden's words had implied. Every completed form was scrutinized by the authorities of Scotland Yard, who, before approving it, satisfied themselves that the applicant was not only a British subject but of British descent for at least two generations, that he had not been connected with any disloyal organization such as the disbanded British Union of Fascists, that he had no foreign affiliations such as to justify suspicion, and generally that, as the local police usually expressed it, "we know nothing against him." Thus the first elimination was effected. The second was much more drastic. It was only in the obviously vulnerable areas, with scattered populations, that there was room for every suitable volunteer. In London and the large towns, where many were called, very few were chosen.[9] The only people who were reasonably certain of being required were Bisley marksmen, prize-winning members of rifle clubs, and African explorers whose lives had depended on their ability to shoot straight; for it was still assumed that the primary function of the Volunteers would be to wing the descending parachutist before he could attempt any mischief.

The force was still in this embryonic state at the end of June, the month of the evacuation of Dunkirk and the collapse of France. It had no training and no regular duties, and its only weapons—as all the rifles were needed by the regular Army—were shot-guns, old service revolvers, or whatever the individual members might happen to possess. Looking back upon that critical period, we can understand Lord Halifax's feeling that Hitler missed the best chance he was ever likely to have. The principal reason for his hesitation, as is generally agreed, was the inability of the German mind to adapt its cast-iron plans to a new situation; but the mere existence of the Volunteers may have been a contributory cause,

[9] I cannot say what the usual proportion was, but it is within my own knowledge that a retired naval Commander who had been made responsible for a certain area had instructions not to accept more than two hundred of the number available. He already had over a thousand completed forms, all approved by Scotland Yard, and the end was not in sight. The Commander's comments on the problem before him had a certain nautical ring.

for it is probable that the Germans imagined it to be a far more formidable obstacle than it actually was. All that can be said with certainty is that the German Propaganda Department was never tired of abusing that nefarious gang of criminals, bandits, and murderers, which Mr Churchill was supposed to be organizing for the discomfiture of the *Herrenvolk*. Presumably it derived its information from Mr Eden's appeal, from occasional allusions in news bulletins to the vast numbers who had responded, and, most of all, from the English newspapers; for the newspapers had devoted a large amount of space to accounts and discussions of the movement, and may, unwittingly, have given the enemy a false impression of its strength.

There was, in fact, about the end of June and the first half of July, a somewhat acute controversy. The Local Defence Volunteers had no uniform except a detachable armlet, usually kept in reserve to be worn on special occasions; the officers, who would be more correctly described as leaders, or local organizers, depended on the kind of loyalty which a football team renders to the captain, and could not, in the last resort, have enforced their commands; the rank and file were not bound by an oath of allegiance, and were free at any time to give fourteen days' notice of their intention to resign.[10] It was contended that a body so constituted was not a combatant force according to international law, and that, should it ever be in action, the enemy would be justified in treating its members as *franc-tireurs*. The natural and obvious reply, that the Germans could not appeal to rules which they had themselves violated in every clause and section, was not made in responsible quarters. The defenders of the Volunteers argued that international law does, in fact, allow the civilian population of an invaded country to take up arms in self-defence, and that the

[10]It was stated officially that the number who had availed themselves of this privilege during the first six months was less than 5,000, out of a total of approximately 1,500,000. This is a remarkably small proportion when it is considered that a Home Guardsman was expected, and, in fact, required, to give priority to his ordinary work if that work was of a kind essential to the prosecution of the war. In the early days, before there was any regular training, there could be no question of a clash of duties; but as parades and instruction began to assume greater importance, and to demand more time, many of those who were already working long hours in munition factories must have found it impossible to continue. The number of resignations for merely frivolous or inadequate reasons was, there is every reason to believe, negligible.

Germans, when they lived in fear of French aggression, had been the strongest upholders of that right. We will not pursue the debate into its finer intricacies; it is enough to say that each side could make out a case, and that no conclusion was ever reached.

There were critics of another school of thought who concerned themselves less with academic and legal subtleties than with the practical exigencies of the situation. It was most unlikely, they argued, that parachute troops would dare to perform their tricks in a densely populated country where they could not hope to land unobserved, and where they could not be reinforced, as in countries contiguous to Germany, by advancing bodies of infantry; but, if they should be so rash, the regular Army would attend to them. The really serious danger, it was said, was from the enemy within the gates. It was known that there was a Quisling in England, ready and eager to set up as a Dictator in subordination to Hitler, and though he, with the Goerings and Ribbentrops of the movement, was now rehearsing his part behind the walls of Brixton Prison, his lesser followers were probably going about unrecognized. The thousands of refugees from the occupied countries also caused uneasiness, for it was virtually certain that there were Nazi agents among them.

It was proposed, accordingly, that the Volunteers should act as a kind of auxiliary Police Force, to guard against spying and sabotage, and for a short time this alternative plan seemed to find favour. Nothing more was heard of those "military reasons" which had induced Mr Eden to exclude the great centres of population from the scope of his appeal. The numerous applicants who had been rejected as superfluous were invited to offer themselves again, and were, as a rule, accepted. The force, thus augmented, was supplied with police truncheons, though those who had revolvers of their own still carried them. Its principal duty was to guard places of vital importance, such as bridges, reservoirs, factories, and telephone exchanges. The results achieved, though hardly commensurate with the time and effort expended, were not entirely negligible. There are specimens of the *Herrenvolk* behind bars at the time of writing who might still have been acting the part of whining refugees if they had not been collared by the Volunteers while taking an interest in aerodromes or gun emplacements.

The beginning of the next, and perhaps the final, phase of

development is marked by Mr Churchill's broadcast speech of July 15. It will be remembered that Mr Eden, in commending the name "Local Defence Volunteers," had said that that name described the duties of the force in three words; but now that the Nazis had overrun so much of the Continent that one could smell them from Dover,[11] the word *defence*, with all its connotations, fell into sudden disrepute. The name of André Maginot, formerly held in reverence, became a synonym for every sort of stupidity, complacency, and even cowardice, and it was agreed that, whatever might be done to fortify this island, we must at all costs avoid the errors characteristic of a "Maginot mentality." Mr Churchill, perhaps unconsciously, interpreted this change of feeling when he said, after speaking of the readiness of the regular Army to resist an invader:

> Behind these, as a means of destruction for parachutists, air-borne invaders, and any traitors that may be found in our midst—and I do not believe there are many, woe betide them, they will get short shrift—we have more than a million of the Local Defence Volunteers, or, as they are much better called, the Home Guard. These officers and men, a large proportion of whom have been through the last war, have the strongest desire to attack and come to close quarters with the enemy, wherever he may appear.

In recalling these words today it is interesting to notice how the past, present and future are brought together under one comprehensive glance. When Mr Churchill spoke of the destruction of parachutists and air-borne invaders he was reverting to the original function of the Volunteers, now absorbed in a larger scheme; when he included "any traitors that may be found in our midst" he referred to the police duties which the Volunteers were actually performing at that moment; when, finally, he proposed a new name from which the word *defence* was excluded, and spoke of the strong desire of the Home Guard "to attack and come to close quarters with the enemy," he anticipated a development soon to be realized, but not at that time generally foreseen.

Thus the Local Defence Volunteers became the Home Guard, and efforts were made to give effect to everything implied by the change. Except at certain places, where armed watchfulness was thought supremely necessary, the police duties reverted to the natural custodians of the law, and the police truncheons dis-

[11] Mr J. B. Priestley remarked recently, after a visit to Dover, that Matthew Arnold's histrionics on "Dover Beach" filled him with a strong desire to slap the elegant author on the back and say, "Buddy, you ain't seen nothing."

appeared. Every unit came into possession of a sufficiency of rifles and ample stores of ammunition. Most of the time available was spent on instructional parades, lectures, and practice in the management of the daintier lethal novelties. A hideous denim uniform was approved by the War Office, and arrived in mountainous quantities. A distinguished soldier, General Eastwood, was appointed Inspector-General. One of the stately homes of England, Osterley Park, was lent by the Earl of Jersey to be the Sandhurst or West Point of the Home Guard so long as it should be required. The days of mufti and armlets, of revolvers and shotguns, of appointments equivalent to flag rank accepted casually over the telephone, faded into the dim and almost incredible past.

In a speech on September 9, Mr Churchill referred to the Home Guard again. He repeated in substance the claim which he had made in July, but this time he was able to state as literal fact what had formerly had the air of prophesy. "Our shores," he said,

> are well fortified and strongly manned, and behind them, ready to attack the invaders, we have a far larger and better equipped mobile army than we have ever had before. Behind this, we have more than 1,500,000 men of the Home Guard, who are just as much soldiers of the Regular Army in status as the Grenadier Guards, and who are determined to fight for every inch of ground in every village and in every street.

That would be the final answer, if any were needed, to the objection that the Home Guard was a body of *franc-tireurs*. Not long afterwards it underlined Mr Churchill's words by shooting down a German bomber that had ventured within range of rifle fire, and it is prepared to repeat the performance whenever an opportunity may occur.

It must have been about the same time that the War Office decided to send large reinforcements to General Wavell, enabling him ultimately to pulverize the forces of Graziani and liquidate most of the Italian Empire in Africa. Sir Robert Gordon-Finlayson, the head of the Western Command, has stated publicly that "it would not have been possible to have sent out so many men and so much equipment if the Home Guard had not been there to block the path of an enemy landing on these shores."[12] The Home Guard was not aware that it had this special responsibility, but it needed no admonition to take its duties seriously, for the great battle of

[12] *Daily Sketch*, Feb. 2, 1941.

the air was a continual reminder that this island had attractions for the German High Command.

Every fine day—and most days were fine—from the second week in August to the third week in September crowds of white dots appeared in the sky; puffs of smoke were emitted in all directions, and at frequent intervals tiny figures could be seen descending to the earth. At the end of the day it would be announced that thirty, fifty, eighty, or more than a hundred Heinkels and Messerschmitts had been brought down.[13] The Royal Air Force also suffered losses, as was inevitable, but not, as a rule, more than a third of the German casualties in machines or a sixth in pilots. The hills surrounding Dover collected, it was said, the largest assembly of newspaper correspondents to be seen anywhere in the world. In the streets, trains, and buses, questions about the "lunch score" were asked and answered as regularly as in times when a county cricket match was the event of the day. On one occasion the B.B.C. broadcast a running commentary by a man who had been famous for his verbal descriptions of sporting contests, but in some quarters the experiment was disapproved, and it was not repeated.

The first three days would have been enough to demonstrate that the attempt to gain mastery of the air on this side of the

[13]In some neutral countries there was an inclination to doubt the accuracy of the official figures and to suppose that the truth must lie somewhere between them and the claims of the German Propaganda Department. The fact is that the Air Ministry drew up its bulletins in the manner of a cautious and somewhat unimaginative Civil Servant, never counting any German machine in the total unless it had been actually seen to crash, however badly it might have been damaged and however small its chance of completing the return journey. See Sir Archiband Sinclair's answer to questions on the subject in the House of Commons on August 21, 1940. Air Commodore Goddard has stated recently that in his belief the Germans lost not less than 220 planes on September 15, though the Air Ministry claimed only 185.

The decisive fact is that the Germans finally broke off the contest without having achieved anything. What conceivable reason could they have had for doing so if, with the advantage of superior numbers at the beginning, they had inflicted those immense losses, at little cost to themselves, of which they boasted after each of the battles? If half their claims were true they must have had decisive victory within their grasp at the time when they discontinued the attack, or, for that matter, long before.

Since the above was written the full story of our victory has been told in *The Battle of Britain*, reviewed in the preceding section of "The War and Opinion."

Channel was a hopeless failure, but the wooden German mind could not adjust itself to a fact outside its calculations. The only rule it knew was to try, try, and try again. In time it became evident that the *Luftwaffe* was not only defeated but demoralized. The ratio of German to British losses increased from an original three or four to one to seven or eight to one. German pilots who had been in England before the war crashed from no apparent cause, and admitted that they were glad to be back here as prisoners. Others, who were genuine casualties, stated that they had been warned not to let themselves be captured whatever happened, as the English always tortured any German who fell into their hands. From this it may be inferred that the German High Command did not trust the fighting spirit of its airmen.

On the night of September 14, the Home Guard received an order which had better not be quoted, but was taken as an intimation that the flat-bottomed barges might make their appearance at any moment. Much had happened since June, and though the Germans could not be prevented from setting out on the great misadventure, there was considerable confidence that they could be prevented from ever getting back. What secret information the War Office may have had is not revealed, but it is a fact that the next morning, September 15, the fields of Kent were strewn with more heaps of wreckage than had ever been seen before. The Germans had made their supreme effort. According to the official figures they lost 185 fighters and bombers, with, of course, the whole of their crews; the British lost twenty-five fighters, but twelve of the pilots made safe landings. After that the attacks diminished in intensity, and by the end of the month they had ceased entirely. In two months the Germans had lost over two thousand aircraft and over six thousand trained airmen, presumably the cream of the *Luftwaffe*.

Whether the battle is to be renewed during the coming summer may well be known before these words appear in print. At present it seems unlikely, as the Royal Air Force is stronger, both absolutely and relatively to the *Luftwaffe*, than it was last autumn, and is assured of technical superiority for as long as can be foreseen.[14] For the Home Guard, therefore, the prospect is one of alert and strenuous inactivity. But it is usual to insure against fire and

[14]See Sir Archibald Sinclair's statement in the House of Commons on March 11, 1941.

burglary however well protected the house may be, and the Home Guard supplies the equivalent of that last precaution. It is true that, in circumstances only just imaginable, the insurance might be inoperative. If by means of some secret weapon the Germans could gain that complete, unchallengeable control of the air which they had in the Polish campaign, no army, amateur or professional, could offer any effective resistance. Factories, docks, aerodromes, and every kind of military establishment would be bombed out of existence. Even the Navy would be thrown on the defensive, and it is doubtful whether it could defend itself indefinitely.

That may be dismissed as the German dream of Paradise, already vanishing before the morning headache. There is another possibility which might have been realized if the battle had been fought in June instead of in August and September, and which must, in theory, be taken into account for the future. Without achieving a decisive victory, the Germans might have won some temporary successes at a few places. With careful management and a certain degree of luck they might have gained control of a suitable landing ground and deluged an undefended area with the contents of troop-carrying planes. In time the marauders would have been rounded up by the regular Army; but the regular Army cannot be everywhere at once, and an immense amount of damage might have been done even in a few hours. If the process had been repeated several times in different places the defences might have been perceptibly weakened, and the way prepared for an invasion from the sea.

The Home Guard is an effective shield against this kind of danger. Its one advantage over the regular Army is that it can be, and is, almost literally, everywhere at once. It covers the country from end to end like the prickles of a hedgehog. No large area of Great Britain is entirely unpopulated, and wherever there is population there is the Home Guard. In any district, however scattered, it could muster greater numbers than could be landed by surprise tactics from troop-carrying planes. It would probably be able to ensure that the landing itself should be attended with disaster; for most units of the Home Guard include a sprinkling of marksmen of no ordinary skill.[15] Failing that, it would be able

[15]Although aircraft often manage to limp back to their bases in spite of severe damage by shell-fire, it remains true that the strongest machine ever built can be brought down by a single rifle bullet if hit in a vital spot at short range. So I have been told by a Group Captain of long experience.

to get its blow in first, and, if that were not enough, it would have the advantage of a knowledge of the locality such as no invader, whatever maps he had studied, could ever hope to possess.

Most of this could be said with equal truth of the Local Defence Volunteers, as they were constituted in the critical month of June; but when we think of the shot-guns and police truncheons we cannot feel that the Volunteers would have been more than a slight impediment to the enemy's movements. In modern war, unfortunately, there are limits to the extent to which the human spirit can compensate for mechanical deficiencies. The Home Guard, as it exists today, is at no disadvantage in arms, equipment, or training. The least to be expected of it is that it would hold the enemy and keep him inactive during the precious interval while the regular Army was on the way; but it is virtually certain that it would accomplish far more than this, and that by the time the regular Army arrived there would be nothing to do but to clear up the mess. The flame would have been extinguished long before it could grow into a conflagration.

III. PLANNING OF CANADA'S WAR EFFORT — A. Brady

In *Canada Fights*[1] six Canadians, presided over by John W. Dafoe of Winnipeg, attempt in less than three hundred pages to explain why Canada is at war and the manner in which she conducted the struggle during the first eighteen months. The attempt, on the whole, results in a well-informed and balanced work of reference.

Chapter II, under the heading "What Is Canada?" is the least satisfactory part of the book, for it commits itself to some patent prejudices and some very dubious historical generalizations. One example will suffice: "The people of Ontario," it is asserted, "are recognizable from Americans and from other Canadians by a certain Puritanism and a lingering Toryism which was born in the backwoods settlements of the United Empire Loyalists." One may be permitted to doubt whether for veritable stubbornness the Puritanism of Ontario can be put in the same category as that of Tennessee or, say, the rural areas of Vermont. And as to the "lingering Toryism" which is said to distinguish Ontarians from other Canadians, one has certainly heard that vague term applied to not a few dwellers in British Columbia, New Brunswick and

[1] *Canada Fights: An American Democracy at War*, edited by J. W. Dafoe, S. J. Reginald Saunders, Toronto, 1941, $2.50.

Nova Scotia, and even to some good citizens of Winnipeg.

The main task of the volume is to describe the war effort of Canada (mainly for readers in the United States), and this it does with laudable clarity and aptness of illustration. A coherent picture emerges of the country's economic planning for war and of the contrasts with the last war, which derive from the mechanized character of modern military technique and the greater maturity of the Canadian economy. The intention is mainly descriptive and apologetic, with some significant criticisms thrown in. A general criticism, well founded, is that the Dominion has been producing too much of too many things, and that its effort would be made more effective by concentrating upon fewer items. The error at the outset was due to the lack of intimate collaboration between Great Britain, the United States and Canada in the beginning of the struggle. It is not yet too late to achieve a concentration in more specialized production, since complete collaboration with the United States is now secure. A less convincing criticism is that Canada developed an army larger than was necessary, thereby depriving its factories of skilled labour. The present Canadian army does not seem too large for a country with more than eleven million people and with a determination to defeat Hitler in any attempt to conquer the British Isles.[2] The real mistake was and is the absence of a carefully selective draft. Canada has yet to apply adequate selection to its use of man-power, and until it does so the material planning of the war effort will be defective.

Mr Dafoe and his associates rightly emphasize—with illustration—that in the present struggle the Dominion has retained the essentials of democracy, and because of respect for democratic procedure action is not always what the expert would recommend but what the pressure of public opinion dictates. Yet inevitably the expert has come into the driver's seat, for (to alter the image) skilful planning is impossible without expert diagnosis and prescription. Exchange control, price control, rent control, rationing, a system of priorities, and all the other widening efforts at management of the economy, imply bureaucratic direction; major economic effort is geared from the centre. It must be candidly admitted that this development involves some surrender of democratic procedures; increasingly action must be taken without

[2]An army much smaller could not expect to take its share in military action overseas, and apart from British necessities this situation would not be tolerated by Canadian opinion.

waiting to test public opinion, let alone waiting for public opinion to assert itself. The exigences of war will not brook delay. If the nation acted in any other manner, it would court defeat. But in this organization for a prolonged and total war, the inner essence of the democratic faith may still be conserved if two principles are respected: equality of sacrifice, and the individual's right to be controlled by a *rule* rather than by arbitrary action of a bureaucrat.

The necessity for equality of sacrifice can hardly be over-emphasized, although the difficulties of its thorough application are evident. Such difficulties must be overcome, for acceptance of the principle cannot be eluded in a state which endeavours to remain democratic. In a peace economy where thorough national economic planning was attempted this principle would be essential. In a war economy its application is if anything more imperative, for in the long run it alone will preserve that decisive factor, morale. When the tensions of reduced standards of life intrude, discontent with the more obvious inequalities of sacrifice will sharpen and become corrosive to the war effort. Equality of sacrifice does not imply the same quantity from all. This in any case is impossible since all are not equal in wealth and capacity. It means that sacrifices must be proportionate. As far as possible they should be made amenable to a progressive rate. In income taxation the Canadian government acts, broadly speaking, in accord with this principle, but the general economic incidence of the war effort is not so clearly in unison with it. Some classes are bearing a proportionately heavier burden than others, and a notable by-product is agrarian discontent. The authors of *Canada Fights* do not analyse this question, but it is crucial in the long-term war exertion. In military service it is doubtful whether the principle can be secured in any other way than by a selective draft, a fact which would be more apparent to the public today if the Canadian overseas forces had been engaged in heavy fighting and had suffered corresponding losses.

In war, discontent is bred and morale impaired, not by the restraints of power in themselves, but by a realization of the fact that power is used to throw more grievous burdens on some individuals and classes than on others. All must be made to suffer and endure together. There must be no privileged. Thereby the sense of unity, born in common sacrifice, will penetrate all classes, and that sense of unity is the essence of national morale.

THE REFORM OF THE LAWS OF ENGLAND, 1640-1660

GOLDWIN SMITH

THE judicious Hooker, in sonorous phrases, vouched for a Tudor system of statecraft that won wide allegiance to the Crown, the Church, and the Law. "Of Law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is in the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage; all with uniform consent admire her as the mother of their peace and joy." With Hooker marched Sir Thomas Smith, and the two doughty champions of the harmonious and decently reasonable middle way have been given an honoured place in history. Few would challenge their right to stand as typical Elizabethan apologists, dedicated to the principles of law and degree and duty. The fact is, however, that the close and continued admiration and study of the golden age of Elizabeth has made inevitable the discovery of numberless contrasts between the rule of the Tudors and the sad destruction born of the Stuarts. These contrasts have been so frequently made and multiplied that the shaping spirit of the historians' imagination threatens at once to create and to destroy: to create a Tudor utopia that never existed; to destroy, in part at least, our ability to sense the temper of the last decades of the sixteenth century.

Obvious and vexatious abuses had their place in the Tudor strong monarchy. A study of the literature of complaint in sixteenth-century England casts a shadow over Froude's familiar picture of a nation filled with harmony and peace and founded in power and stability. The voices of Skelton, Fish, Roy, Starkey, Brinklow and Thomas Wentworth have been too frequently hushed by the historians. The whirlwind that the Stuarts could not ride was not wholly of their own making. Under Cromwell, the new heirs to a new power found themselves plagued by problems that had shadowed the horizon in the preceding century. A single illustration may be seen in the fact that the first concerted movement for law reform, apparently born in the turmoil of the Civil Wars, had its origins in the years when England emerged from the Middle Ages and the Tudors began to create a modern state.

The mediaeval common law had arisen to answer the needs of a mediaeval political and economic organization. In sixteenth-

century England an attempt was made to supplement the deficiencies of an outworn legal system in an effort to solve the new and unfamiliar problems of a nascent modern society. Thus there occurred the creation of new bodies of rules, new courts, and new councils. By these creations, by the gradual adaptation of the old machinery to new uses, by the development of convenient legal fictions, by judicial decisions and parliamentary legislation, the expansion of the law proceeded at a bewildering pace. The result of these years of rapid growth and hasty grafting was a legal system twisted by contradictions and deformed by anomalous survivals. Rival courts disputed rights of jurisdiction. Difficulties that even those learned in the law could not resolve threatened on occasion completely to clog the channels by which the law of England was administered. By the early seventeenth century many advocates of reform declared the courts and the legal system to be the true embodiment of everything that was cumbersome, dilatory, and expensive.

When Cromwell and his allies had entrenched their forces, almost all existing institutions were put on trial. In the years when old idols were melted down and cast anew, it was inevitable that a demand should arise for a searching and strict examination of the law and the law courts. A multitude clamoured to reform, to overthrow, to threaten with final extinction, not only the body of enacted law but also the system of courts by which it was administered. "The major part of the laws made in this nation," declared William Cole, "are founded on principles of tyranny, fallacy and oppression. . . . The law in the generality is unjust and irrational, the execution desperately dangerous and changeable; it is easier to find a thousand evils in it, than one true principle in matter or form."[1]

Extremists in religion carried their fanaticism into the spheres of government and legal theory.[2] In agreement with these restless

[1]William Cole, "A Rod for the Lawyers: Who are hereby declared to be the Grand Robbers and Deceivers of the Nation" (July 12, 1659) (*Harleian Miscellany*, 1808, IV, p. 319). The day of the month, here and elsewhere, is that recorded by Thomason on his copy in the British Museum. See also G. P. Gooch, *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1927), Appendix B; R. Robinson, "Anticipation under the Commonwealth of Changes in the Law" (*Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History*, ed. E. Freund, W. E. Mikell, *et al.*, Boston, 1907-9).

[2]For examples see: the reports of the Putney and Whitehall Debates and other documents in *Puritanism and Liberty*, ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse (London,

and unstable minds were many cautious and sober men who shared the general feeling of discontent and supported the demand for change in the form and administration of the law. If divers groups were united by a common opposition to the legal system, the unity of opinion went no further. Differences in the advocacy of means and methods, in the conception of a final perfect and neatly articulated structure, these presented difficulties that were not easily overcome.

Many of the writers who commenced and continued assaults upon the established system of law were intellectually baffled by the operation of the legal machinery. Their phrases mutilated the language of the law and their plans for reform were frequently those of men stupefied by a body of knowledge whose secrets they had not plumbed. They were determined, however, to end their grievances even if the proposed panacea proved a mischief instead of a benefit. The law must be altered to conform to justice. It must become the instrument rather than the arbiter of human purposes. It must cease to be a legal and administrative device for binding with chains the unenlightened. In the maze of its complicated machinery all sense of simplicity had vanished. The common law was locked in the judges' breasts. It was difficult to believe that Sir Edward Coke had not nodded when he declared that the unwritten laws of England had been "divinely cast into the hearts of men and built upon the irremovable rock of reason." Surely the secret and intricate common law could be made to yield to the pressure of the layman and be translated into a few rules, simple and easily understood. Certainly it seemed possible that the administration of justice could be made speedy and equitable. "Some real compensation is desired by the people for all their sufferings, losses and blood. The end of all just laws is safety and freedom . . . and equal and speedy distribution of right ought to be the abstract and epitome of all laws."[3]

The genesis of much of the agitation may be found in the severity of the criminal code. "There is no necessity for the law

1938); the *Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, ed. George H. Sabine (Ithaca, N.Y., 1940); David W. Petegorsky, *Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War* (London, 1940).

[3]John Warr, "The Corruption and Deficiency of the Laws of England" (1649) (*Harleian Miscellany*, III, p. 250).

to keep people in dread and awe."[4] The fond and needless submission to harsh and unjust laws was a dishonourable badge of infamy.[5] "Why do some laws exceed the offence?" asks Warr, in the pamphlet cited above. "Why are men's lives forfeited by the law on light or trivial grounds? Why is our law a meander of intricacies? Why are so many men destroyed for want of formality and punctilio? . . . Is not trial by combat reasonless? Why should the laws of England be in an unknown tongue? Why should a murderer be allowed to live if a thief be condemned to die? This severity is one of the abominations of the time, for which the saints ought to mourn."

A second cause of complaint lay in the evils associated with the Court of Chancery. It had a bad origin and worse record. Years had been known to elapse before the final settlement of a case lost in the labyrinth of its intricate and cumbersome methods. "Quick justice"—thus went Samuel Chidley's epigram—"makes quiet Commonwealths."[6] "Away with it," cries another writer; "no greasing of the wheels; no patching and mending of the machine; destroy it, bolt and crank and lever, and end this engine of oppression and corruption."[7]

A third evil, and one that came very near to the average man, was the expense involved in an appeal to the law. If a suit were instituted to recover a debt, it frequently happened that the cost of recovery was greater than the amount of the original debt. The changes in matters of land law and conveyance were equalled in injustice only by the amount of the sheriff's fee. Nor did the litigants in cases involving property rights escape unfleeced. "I have heard of two men, who fell at variance about a hive of bees, and went to law, until he that had spent least, had spent £500."[8] The doubtful accuracy of the assertion does not alter the fact of evident irritation behind the determined challenge to the common,

[4]John Hare, *Plain English*,(Nov. 4, 1647).

[5]*The Law's Discovery* by "a Well-Wisher to His Country" (June 27, 1653).

[6]Samuel Chidley, "A Cry against a Crying Sin" (April 14, 1652) (*Harleian Miscellany*, VIII, p. 477).

[7]John Hedworth, "An Oppressed Man's Outcry"(1649) (*Harleian Miscellany*, V, p. 612). Cf. Henry Robinson, *Certain Proposals in Order to a New Modelling of the Laws* (1653).

[8]William Corey, "The Present State of England" (*Harleian Miscellany*, III, p. 210). Cf. F. A. Inderwick, *The Interregnum, 1648-1660* (London, 1891), p. 222.

costly and offensive evils of the law.

Annoying and irksome as were these many manifestations of the oppressions of the law itself, the full weight of abuse fell not upon the law, but upon the administration of it. The lawyers were regarded as the defenders of a fortress behind whose walls were protected all the iniquities and inequalities of a hated system. Potent, rich and dreadful were the lawyers, and under their skilled manipulation the law became anything or nothing to serve their corrupt self-interest. "The law as it is now constituted," says Ludlow, "serves only to maintain the lawyers and to encourage the rich to destroy the poor."[9] The lawyer, with his "great and questionable parchments," was an "insatiate cannibal" who stole, oppressed and went "clothed in a genteel garb and all his family."[10] It was the lawyers who had disinherited the people of their common right. It was the lawyers who took the money and then departed.

> Like careful bees, to their own hives they flew
> As he from fortune, they from him withdrew.[11]

"Be you at last instrumental," wrote Henry Parker to the Army, "to free your country from the intolerable burden of the needless lawyers, who love none but themselves."[12] On the eve of the Restoration, in the pamphlet cited above, William Cole, the most unrelenting opponent of the lawyers and their works, ended his labours with a note of warning and a message of optimism: "It is thy duty and every honest Englishman's in the land, to take care hereafter never to choose any of that generation to make laws for us. . . . I do not altogether despair, that before I die I may see the inns of courts, those dens of thieves, converted into hospitals."

For the judges as well as the lawyers there were words of censure and invective. John Pym, at the opening of the Parliament of 1640, had enumerated, among other grievances, "the extra-judicial decisions of the judges, without hearing of counsel or argument." William Sheppard in his famous tract, *England's*

[9]E. Ludlow, *Memoirs*, ed. C. H. Firth (Oxford, 1894), I, p. 275.

[10]*Experimental Essay Touching the Reformation of the Laws of England* (Aug. 17, 1648).

[11]E. Ludlow, *Memoirs*, I, p. 279.

[12]H. Parker, "A Word to the Army" (Oct. 24, 1647) (*Harleian Miscellany*, IV, p. 325).

Balme, recommended that "all judges be beneath justice and accountable to some above them, by whom their judgement may be examined and miscarriage punished."[13] Winstanley considered the law to be a badge of slavery to all but the gentry and clergy; the rest of the people "are left servants and bondsmen . . . ; none have freedom by the laws but those two sorts of people; all the common people have been, and still are, burdened under them."[14]

There was one small but noisy group who spread their doctrines with vividness and force. They expressed the desire to repudiate all human law, to summon the people of England from the wilderness of sin and establish the rule of the Law of God. All things that were repugnant to His law were to be abolished. If the law were made in accordance with the will of the Almighty then the principle of justice would triumph indeed. With the zeal that their aims suggest they preached the doctrine of the forcible overthrow of all existing laws. Hugh Peters proposed that even the old records in the Tower be burned as monuments of tyranny and sin.[15] In this, as in many a similar movement, Winstanley had his share. "The Reformation," he wrote to Fairfax, "is according to the word of God and that is the pure law of righteousness before the fall, which made all things and to which all things are to be restored."[16] But it was not Winstanley whose voice was heard most often in the struggle. Perhaps in a moment of despair Samuel Chidley took a text from Hosea: "I have written to him the great things of my law; but they were counted a strange thing." He wrote to the Lord Mayor of London: "All laws which are not according to God's law and pure reason, are void and null; it is the word of God which is binding and yet is not bound." He wrote to the Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer: "It is time for

[13]W. Sheppard, *England's Balme* (Oct. 25, 1656) (cited in W. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, VI, p. 421).

[14]Winstanley to Lord Fairfax (1649) (*Harleian Miscellany*, VIII, p. 590). Cf. H. Parker, *Observations* (1642) (*Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-1647*, ed. W. Haller, New York, 1934, II, p. 168); T. C. Pease, *The Leveller Movement* (Washington, 1916), p. 132; Henry Marten, *Vox Plebis* (Nov. 19, 1646); John Cook, *The Vindication of the Professors and the Profession of the Law* (Feb. 16, 1646).

[15]Hugh Peters, *Good Work for a Good Magistrate or a Short Cut to Great Quiet* (1651). Peters's proposal to destroy the whole system of English law aroused the anger of R. V. of Gray's Inn, who replied to Peters in *A Plea for the Common Laws of England* (1651).

[16]*Harleian Miscellany*, VIII, p. 592.

thee Lord to work, for they have made void thy law." He wrote to the General Council of the Army: "God is the only law-maker and His law is the ancientest and best that ever was." He wrote to the Parliamentary Committee on Law Reform: "For doubtless, the standing of the statutes and judgements of the holy and blessed God is a most blessed work; and the establishment thereof will work a more blessed reformation, than hath yet been, or shall be spoken of, at this time."[17] But no one heeded Samuel Chidley. The "blessed reformation" did not occur and the Law of God was not established.

The strenuous and persistent efforts of a few obscure individuals, such as John Hare, had resulted in the growth of another movement known as anti-Normanism. The declared purpose of the leaders was to bring England back to those laws "which were before William the Conqueror came in." To the laws that William introduced, "by the iniquity of precedent times and the ignorant negligence of the present we still remain subject."[18] The figure of Winstanley appeared once more, declaiming against "the burden of the Norman yoke." By his side were Walwyn and Lilburne. It was John Hare, however, who became the moving spirit in the Anti-Norman party. "The innovations of the conquest are a just cause of the disrelishment and contempt of our laws (so Normanized in matter and form) by understanding men; and no doubt they are the ground of that general and inbred hatred which still dwells in our common people against our laws and lawyers."[19] "The Normans," observed John Warr, "established our laws and they were of all nations the most quarrelsome in contriving controversies and suits." An anonymous writer commented upon "the stupid degenerateness of these members of a Teutonic nation." "Let us remove this mountain of dishonour," he wrote, "and let us propose that all laws and usages introduced from Normandy be abolished and a supply made from St Edward's laws . . . unless it may seem honourable for Englishmen to imprison their laws in

[17]Samuel Chidley, *op. cit.* Cf. W. Harris, *An Historical and Critical Account of Hugh Peters* (1751). The writer has used the reprint of George Smeeton, first published in 1818 and later included in Smeeton's *Historical and Biographical Tracts*, II (London, 1821).

[18]John Hare, *England's Proper and Only Way* (Jan. 24, 1648).

[19]John Hare, "Anti-Normanism, or St. Edward's Ghost" (Aug. 17, 1647) (*Harleian Miscellany*, VI, p. 72).

the language of their enemies." It is doubtful, however, if the anti-Normans ever constituted a large body of opinion. Fortescue had earlier observed that the changes at the Conquest had been "not so much in substance as in the names of things" and outside of the militant anti-Norman group there appears to have been little inclination to dispute that conclusion.

The former unity of the Army and Parliament, of Independents, Puritans and Presbyterians soon changed with victory to disunity and discord. As it had been the Army that had defeated the Royalists, so now it was the Army majority in the Rump Parliament that cut the knot of the problem of supremacy, decided the form of a new constitution, and dictated the policies of the Commonwealth.

Even before the dissolution of the Rump Parliament the campaign against the lawyers and their laws had commenced. In October, 1650, the first Parliamentary Committee report on law reform was presented to the House. "Whether the Rump passed these laws I do not find, but if they did not, they might have done, had they been let alone."[20]

A second Committee was appointed on January 20, 1651, "to take into consideration what inconveniences were in the law, how the mischief that grows from delays, the changeableness and inequalities in the law may be prevented and the speediest way to prevent the same." It was difficult, however, for this group to undertake or complete any practicable policy of reform. There were few men among them who understood the technical complexities of the problems, or could have hoped for successful or effective action. Sir Matthew Hale and Anthony Ashley Cooper found it difficult to co-operate with such men as Hugh Peters. "Peters," observed Whitelocke, "understood very little of the law, but was very opinionative and would frequently mention some proceeding of law in Holland wherein he was altogether mistaken."[21] The majority of the Committee feared and distrusted the lawyers. When the latter discoursed upon the necessity of restoring the known law in its "full and authentical force" their opponents saw the foes of reform in the advocates of restoration. If a civilian

[20]Roger Cope, "A Detection of the Court and State of England" (*Clarke Papers*, Camden Society, IV, p. 364).

[21]Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs*, I, p. 521. Cf. W. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 19, in G. Smeeton, *Historical and Biographical Tracts.*

who had practised in the Court of Admiralty described in glowing terms the simplicity and uniformity of the civil law and desired its adoption in place of an abolished common law, the lay members of a Committee who knew not the civil law, suspected in the eulogy a veiled conspiracy to foist upon them a system unknown and undesirable. From the day of its first meeting the Committee was divided. The lawyers were determined to resist these ignorant men who had been placed in power to clear the channels of the law. "The people's safety," it was remarked, "is never at a greater hazard than when it is put into its own hands."[22] It was indeed a strange and motley assembly; the laymen, many of the meanest rank in fortune and understanding, resolved not to be outwitted by the unscrupulous lawyers; they resolved to strike terror into the learned bodies of the clergy and the law. At first they were confident of their position and proficiency and were quite willing to rush in where lawyers feared to tread. It was not long, however, before they became lost in a maze of ill-concocted and worse-considered proposals. Their ambition was to make one complete and methodical abridgement of the whole common and statute law; to remove the difficulties and make clear and certain what was obscure. In vexation and despair Ludlow recorded that the Committee discussed the word "incumbrance" for three months before its meaning could be ascertained. "The reformation of the law," he wrote, "went on but slowly, it being in the interests of the lawyers to preserve the lives, liberties and estates of the whole nation in their hands."[23] It may be remarked that the actions of the lawyers were not always justified; indeed, the adoption of some excellent suggestions was often hindered or prevented by their indiscriminate opposition.

Here for the first time an opportunity presented itself for the translation into law of one policy widely approved. As early as 1646 Hugh Peters preached a sermon before both Houses of Parliament, in which he expressed his desire that "some short way might be found to further justice." By the establishment of courts in every county the expense and delay resulting from the

[22]H. Ferne, *Conscience Satisfied* (April 18, 1643), p. 35. Cf. R. Wiseman, *Law of Laws* (Oct. 29, 1656); George Fox, *The Law of God* (Nov. 12, 1654).

[23]E. Ludlow, *op. cit.*, I, p. 333. Cf. W. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 20: "No great matter followed from this Committee by reason of the hurry of the times, and the opposition which the lawyers made to it."

necessity of taking suits to the quarterly courts at Westminster would be brought to an end. Chancery would be deposed from its exalted position and the great common law courts would cease to oppress and terrify. "Why should wills be probated at London . . . at such a charge and distance? . . . Why is it not better to have a civil suit tried in the neighbourhood, while it is fresh and green and new, when the witnesses are alive, . . . than seven, ten or twenty years after the suit is commenced?"[24] Finally, despite the opposition of the lawyers, a bill was prepared providing for the creation of county registries, but not for local courts. From the many weeks of discord there emerged other proposals for reform. The larger number were neither wise nor practicable. There were, however, some few drafts of bills worthy of consideration and debate. These included measures for the more easy and speedy recovery of debts, against duels and challenges, against bribery and extortion by lawyers and judges, for better procedure in cases civil and criminal. To this last draft was appended a table of maximum fees to be charged by members of the legal profession. On January 24, 1652, Parliament discussed the drafts sent up by Hale's Committee.[25]

Barebones' assembly had already aroused the conservative instincts of the Army officers. The Saints, instead of making peace, were bringing a still greater unrest to England. Cromwell repented of his enthusiasms and the Saints, in December, 1653, were sent to join the motley and growing opposition. For the second time the cause of law reform had been halted by a political crisis.

To Cromwell the officers of the Army went in November, 1654, "to desire him to take care for the bringing about of a due regulating of the law." A third time the champions of reform believed that reform would be at last achieved. It was not until early in 1656 that the Protector finally appointed his Committee. "There are wicked and abominable laws," he declared, "which it will be in your power to alter. To hang a man for six and eight pence . . . to acquit murder . . . this is a thing God will reckon for."[26] In this Committee, as in that of 1651, a large number of

[24] *The Law's Discovery*, Proposal xvi. Cf. *supra*, n. 5.

[25] Cf. *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (London, 1911); Holdsworth, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 423-8; *Somers' Tracts*, VI, pp. 184-239.

[26] T. Carlyle, *Speeches and Letters of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. S. G. Lomas (London, 1904), IV, p. 209.

well-meaning but helpless amateurs were included. Many of these were opposed to Whitelocke because he was a lawyer and would trouble their proceedings by "telling them what was the law upon every occasion, and their affairs would not permit to tie themselves up in those rules of law."[27]

It has been noted in another context that the Committee of 1651 passed several weeks in the discussion of the necessity for a system of local courts. The men of 1656 determined to end the intolerable strangle-hold of the common law courts and of chancery. They assured the people that they would not be distracted from their purpose by any apprehension of what the lawyers might do, or suffer themselves to be hypnotized by the fine and flowery words of men more cunningly wise than they. A "new model for provincial courts," suggested in 1655 by William Sheppard, had been favourably received by Cromwell and his Council. A newsletter to the army in Scotland reported that the event "much startled the lawyers and the City." A dispatch of October, 1656, relates that "my Lord Lambert yesterday brought into the House an act for setting up courts of justice and equity at York, which startles the lawyers to see the administration of the law like to be carried into the provinces." In the same month the bill for establishing county registries was read. "It received a very large debate, because of the opposition it received from the long robe."[28] Neither Lord Lambert's brave bill nor the County Registries bill passed. Two Acts were passed, however, of interest and importance. The first abolished *peine forte et dure*. The second provided for the translation of all laws into English and the use of English in all pleadings. "It is amazing," writes Whitelocke, "that so good a law should not have been continued after the Restoration."[29] Yet there appeared, on the whole, to be reason for satisfaction. Cromwell was speaking with sincerity, though not with foresight, when he said to his last Parliament: "You have made many very good laws, the effect whereof the people of this commonwealth will with comfort find hereafter."[30]

[27]Whitelocke, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 255.

[28]*Clarke Papers*, III, pp. 61, 76, 80.

[29]Whitelocke, *op. cit.*, I, p. 475. Cf. W. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 21: "It is amazing so good a law should not have been continued by proper authority after the Restoration! But it was a sufficient Reason then to disuse a thing, though ever so good in itself, that it had been enacted by an usurped power. Of such fatal consequences are prejudices!"

[30]*Clarke Papers*, III, p. 83.

The period following the death of the Protector gave no opportunity for experiment or reform. With the story of Richard Cromwell and the rise and fall of successive groups in the months leading to the Restoration we are not here concerned. Of the long list of law reforms only a few were accepted after 1660. Since many of the grievances still continued, many of the proposals of the Interregnum Committees were adopted in the last quarter of the century; others became law in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It is true that the Restoration swept away whatever hopes the law reform movement may have had for success. Yet there were other reasons for its failure. Time and conditions were unsuitable. There was little stability in government. Three committees of Parliament found their work brought to an unexpected termination by sudden dissolution. The spectre of foreign wars and the shadow of conspiracies at home were seldom absent. It is evident also that a period of emotional disturbances does not provide the atmosphere necessary for calm and unhurried judgment. Nor is this all. We cannot overlook the fact that there was little agreement among those who were demanding reform. As the sects in religion, so the groups of law reformers were passionately convinced of the perfection of their particular creed and greatly disturbed at the doctrines of others.

On one final question a word should be said. Even if the various reforms had been accomplished, it would not have been to the advantage of the law or the people. Many of these reforms were ingenious. It is equally certain they were not safe. Few noted the complexity of the forces with which they had to deal. Not seldom the result of the desired achievement would have been disillusion. Many of the reformers saw only in the foreground lawyers and unjust laws that sought to reduce the people to impotence. They were successful in transforming the national inertia of the masses into active sympathy; they transformed their complaints into commands. Beyond that they did not go. We cannot do better than conclude with Sir William Holdsworth that it was perhaps wise to suffer many of the evils of the old system of law "that its stability and orderly development might be secured; when the modern constitution, resting ultimately upon the supremacy of law, had been evolved, when the modern rules of private law had

been more fully developed, then it would be time, with greater knowledge and deliberation, to take in hand those reformations which, amid the passion and turmoil of the seventeenth century, it had been possible to foreshadow, but impossible to effect."[31]

[31]Holdsworth, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 430. For echoes of the reform movement see an unknown author's *Proposals for Remedying the Great Charge and Delay of Suits at Law and in Equity* (1706); Daines Barrington, *Observations on the More Ancient Statutes* (5th ed., London, 1796).

AUSTRIAN ORIGINS OF NATIONAL SOCIALISM

H. Gordon Skilling

IT has become common to interpret the National Socialism of contemporary Germany as a mere recrudescence of "Prussian militarism," and to consider the Weimar Republic an unnatural interruption of a basic tendency towards Prussianism in German political life. This is to discount the democratic capacities of the north Germans and to minimize the extent to which National Socialism is the outgrowth of seeds sown among the Germans of the south, especially the Austrian and Sudeten Germans. It is forgotten that at least some of the ideas of National Socialism may be traced back to the nationalism among the Germans of the Hapsburg realm before the Great War, and that Adolf Hitler himself, as a native of that realm and a resident in it up to the age of twenty-three or twenty-four, absorbed much of the spirit and many of the ideas of this nationalism. I propose to examine some of the roots of German nationalism in Austria, with the primary object of throwing light on the Austrian antecedents of contemporary National Socialism, and with the subsidiary purpose of describing the political atmosphere in which Hitler himself grew to manhood.

* * * * *

The year 1866, marking the expulsion of Austria from the German Federation, may be taken as the birth-year of a German nationalist movement in Austria, although nationalist ideas had been earlier expressed by individuals.[1] It was, however, two later events, which gave a decisive impetus to the nationalist movement: the victory of Germany over France in 1870, and the federalist, pro-Slav ministry of Count Hohenwart in 1871, the one stimulating the national pride of Germans in Austria, the other awakening their fears of a de-Germanization of Austria. The influence of these two events was evident in the first numbers of *Deutsche Zeitung*, the new organ of the nationalist tendency, appearing in Vienna from December 17, 1871. The nationalist point of view distinguished itself from that predominant in the German "liberal" or *verfassungstreu* party in placing the interests of the Germans in Austria before the interests of the state. This was not indeed

[1]Cf. P. Molisch, *Geschichte der deutschnationalen Bewegung in Oesterreich* (Jena, 1926), pp. 69 ff.

irredentism, for the "nationalists" argued that the interests of the Austrian state were best served if the superior position of the Germans in it were assured, i.e., if Austria remained, or became, a thoroughly German, centralized state, with no concessions to Slav federalism. The new attitude, however, constituted a challenge to the traditional policy of Austrian Germans, which, while aiming at German hegemony in Austria, had been based on an "Austrian," not a "German" political philosophy.

Until the eighties the new nationalism counted for little in the politics of Austrian Germans, and party differences were based on conflicting conceptions of tactics. The decade after 1879 marked a turning-point in Austrian history, when a government including several Poles and a Czech, and based on a parliamentary majority of Slavs and clerical Germans, ruled the Austrian lands. In the eyes of the non-clerical or "left" Germans, the eighties were years of "Slavization," as a number of legislative and administrative concessions to the Czechs infringed on the hitherto unchallenged position of the Germans, and the nationalism of the non-Germans, especially the Czechs, grew more and more intense. From that time to the ultimate collapse of the Monarchy in 1918, the national conflict of German and Czech in Austria, and in particular in Bohemia, remained one of the primary issues of Austrian politics and exerted an enormous influence on the party-politics of Austro-Germans. This article cannot trace all the permutations of German parties of the left after 1879. Suffice it to say that the question—"state first" or "nation first"?—became the issue on which Austro-Germans divided, although even the "nationalists" did not cease to be loyal to Austria and the Hapsburgs, and the state-first Germans began more and more to emphasize the interests of nation as well as of state. It was in this atmosphere of rising nationalism that the extreme nationalist movement of Georg von Schönerer, a spiritual forerunner of Hitlerism, came into being. Wealthy land-owner and knight of Lower Austria, Schönerer had become a member of Parliament in 1873, belonging to the progressive wing of the dominant German liberals. He soon broke with them, however, to become the spokesman of the extreme nationalism of Austrian students. Devotion to the pan-German idea, hostility towards Czechs and other non-Germans, hatred of the Jews and of the Roman Catholic Church, fear of socialism, contempt for liberalism and parliamentarism, a demagogic social radicalism—all these were the ingredients of the nationalism which Schönerer

had been propagating throughout the decade preceding Hitler's birth in Upper Austria in 1889. Although Schönerer's *Deutsche Volkspartei*, or Pan-German party, as it was later called, was never more than a splinter party, it is generally admitted to have exerted a profound influence on Hitler's political outlook,[2] and to have been the seed of the post-war Nazi movement in Austria and Bohemia.[3]

Schönerer, at a conference of German members of Parliament on October 6, 1879, and at a public meeting on November 10, 1880, had urged in vain the foundation of a German People's party (*Deutsche Volkspartei*) on a national and anti-semitic basis.[4] The first comprehensive statement of this point of view was made a few days later, at the conference of Austrian Germans in Vienna, when Heinrich Friedjung, the historian, proposed a draft programme for a *Deutsche Volkspartei*.[5] Although the proposal was not accepted, the programme warrants consideration as the first full statement of extreme nationalism and as the basis of the subsequent Linz programme of the Schönerer movement. The proposed party, said Friedjung, would take as its guiding principle "the maintenance of the national interests of the Germans of Austria." German was to be made the official state language of Austria. Austria was to have "an independent constitutional position" within the whole monarchy (so that Hungary would not lead Austria by the nose) and was to grant Galicia autonomy (so that, in the absence of the Galician Poles, the Austro-Germans would win a majority over the non-Germans in the Vienna Parliament). The alliance with the German Empire was, for *national* reasons, to be strengthened by becoming a part of the constitutional law of both powers, and was to be supplemented by a customs union and by uniform legislation in certain spheres. The programme made

[2]See *Mein Kampf* (German ed., Munich, 1936), pp. 106 ff. Cf. foot-note on p. 8 of unabridged English edition (Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939); Wickham Steed, *Hitler Whence and Whither?* (London, 1934), p. xiii, and R. Olden, *Hitler The Pawn* (London, 1936), pp. 55 ff.

[3]On this point see Josef Pfitzner, *Sudetendeutsche Einheitsbewegung* (Karlsbad, Leipzig, 1937), p. 28; K. Heiden, *A History of National Socialism* (New York, 1935), pp. 26 ff.; E. Wiskemann, *Czechs and Germans* (London, 1938), p. 278, and M. W. Fodor, "The Austrian Roots of Hitlerism" (*Foreign Affairs*, July, 1936).

[4]For this and the following, see Herwig, *Georg von Schönerer und die Entwicklung des Alldeutschtums in der Ostmark: Ein Lebensbild* (Vienna, 1912-23), 4 vols., especially I, pp. 94-5, II, pp. 294-6.

[5]The text is given in Herwig, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 105-7.

no reference to the Jewish question. Most of the proposals incorporated in Friedjung's draft had already been made by earlier nationalist societies, by *Deutsche Zeitung* or by Schönerer. The draft programme is significant for its completeness and for its role in subsequent developments.

As yet the programme was without a party, although two German members of Parliament, Schönerer and Fürnkranz, announced their acceptance of it. In May, 1881, the bi-weekly *Deutsche Worte* began to appear as the organ of the new movement. In June, 1882, the *Deutschnationale Verein* was established in Vienna as a society for propagating the principles of the movement. In August and September, 1882, a committee of the *Verein* drew up an official programme for the *Deutsche Volkspartei*, as it was to be called. This came to be known as the Linz programme, so named because the inaugural conference of the new party, banned by the police, was to have been held in Linz, in Upper Austria. This Linz programme was destined to be of paramount importance in the development of nationalism in Austria. It followed closely Friedjung's draft, differing only in suggesting a personal union with Hungary, the exclusion from Austria of other Slav provinces (Dalmatia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, and Bukovina) as well as Galicia, a detailed scheme of social reform as well as an expansion of the suffrage.[6] For the time being the publication of the programme remained without decisive effect and the party continued to be represented in Parliament by two persons. It is interesting, and perhaps significant, that some twenty years later Adolf Hitler lived in and near Linz, attended the Linz secondary school, and, according to *Mein Kampf*, sat spellbound at the feet of a pan-German history teacher, absorbing "warm love of my German Austrian homeland, deep hatred of the Austrian state."[7]

Within a few years the principles of the Linz programme were the common stock-in-trade of the more nationally-minded Austrian Germans. The continued gains of the Czechs and the rising tide of Czech nationalism in the early eighties had stimulated an intense nationalism among the Germans of Bohemia, especially those in the largely German districts along the Saxon and Bavarian frontiers. The conflict of German and Czech in Bohemia was in large part responsible for the formation of the "German Club" in 1885, in

[6]For the text, see Herwig, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 113-22, or G. Kolmer, *Parlament und Verfassung in Oesterreich* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1902-14), III, pp. 212-14.

[7]German edition, p. 14 (Eng. ed., pp. 22-3).

opposition to the "German-Austrian Club," in the Vienna Parliament. This division of German parliamentarians into two camps expressed in new form the already mentioned hostility of "state-first" and "nation-first" Germans, and (as before) did not necessarily involve any disloyalty to Austria on the part of the "Germans" or any *volksfeindlich* (hostile-to-the-nation) attitude on the part of the "German-Austrians," although charges to that effect were constantly made on both sides. For the purpose of this article the point to be stressed is that the new German Club was not considered a party of genuine nationalism by the adherents of Schönerer, now calling themselves the *Verband der Deutschnationalen* (Union of German Nationalists) and represented in Parliament by Schönerer, Türk, and Fiegl, or indeed by certain of its own members, who in 1887 broke away to form the *Deutschnationale Vereinigung*. It is to the differentiation, which we shall examine in some detail, between the "orthodox" nationalists and those of the Schönerer type that the emergence of an Austro-German nationalism of the Nazi kind may be traced. Schönerer's nationalism was, as we shall explain, pan-German, anti-semitic, anti-Slav, anti-Austrian, anti-socialist, and anti-liberal, and bears a striking resemblance to the doctrines of Hitler and National Socialism.

It was on the issue of anti-semitism that many Austro-German nationalists parted company with Schönerer. One of the first to take over the principle of anti-semitism from its earlier propagators in Germany, Schönerer had denounced "the semitic domination of gold and phrase" in his election programme in 1879. The Linz Programme, based on the draft composed by the Jew, Friedjung, had contained no anti-semitic clause. Schönerer himself participated in a number of anti-semitic activities in the early eighties, and in 1885 his electoral statement called for "the abolition of the Jewish influence in all spheres of public life," a clause which was thereupon added to the Linz Programme as a twelfth point. Even before this, anti-semitism had unofficially come to be the first requirement of party members and had led to the defection of several of Schönerer's earlier collaborators, including Friedjung, Pernerstorfer, and Steinwender. In the case of Pernerstorfer, the editor of *Deutsche Worte*, it was not anti-semitism as such that led to his break with Schönerer, but the latter's "brutal race standpoint," to quote Schönerer's own words. "We shall never agree," wrote Schönerer in his new organ, *Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte*, "to recognize a Jew as a German because he speaks German or

even because he behaves as a German nationalist, or to strive for, even to approve, any mixture of Germans with Jews."[8] Inconsistently, as an opponent pointed out, Schönerer considered any person or party refusing to accept anti-semitism, or any political enemy, such as a socialist, liberal or moderate nationalist, as *verjudet*, or Judaized.[9] Anti-semitism was, in Schönerer's own words, "the greatest achievement of our century." The German Club, he charged, had been founded solely to avert the danger of a nationalism based on anti-semitism; *Deutsche Zeitung*, which under the editorial guidance of his former colleague, Friedjung, became the official organ of the German Club, was merely an addition to the Jewish press arsenal, already including *Neue Freie Presse*. Although there were many Austrian German nationalists who refused to regard racial anti-semitism as an essential of nationalism, the issue continued to play an important part in German politics in Austria, and Pan-Germanism in Austria maintained its anti-Jewish tendency to the end of the Monarchy.[10] Adolf Hitler was deeply impressed by this doctrine of the Schönerer movement. "Its anti-semitism," he wrote in *Mein Kampf*, " . . . rested on the correct realization of the significance of the race problem and not on religious conceptions."[11]

Schönerer's anti-semitism was closely related to his social and economic philosophy. Both were in large part the product of contemporary political and social circumstances. The German Liberals, the dominant party of Austrian Germans, were the representatives of the highly placed officials of the Austrian bureaucracy, the high officers of the army, the great *bourgeoisie* and landed proprietors, and the wealthier intelligentsia and professional groups.[12] It was not surprising that their social and political outlook should have been conservative, in spite of the misleading party-name, "Liberal," and that their Austrianism should outweigh their Germanism. Theirs was a laissez-faire liberalism, allowing the unhampered advance of large-scale industry at the expense of the small business man and the worker. The less firmly established social groups—lower officials and teachers, petty *bourgeoisie* and

[8]See *Deutsche Worte*, June 16, 1883, and *Unverfälschte Deutsche Worte*, July 1, 1883.

[9]Cf. E. Wengraf, *St. Georg von Zwettl* (Vienna, 3rd ed., 1887), pp. 25-6.

[10]Wickham Steed, *The Hapsburg Monarchy* (London, 1914), p. 173.

[11]German edition, p. 133 (Eng. ed., p. 158).

[12]Cf. Ernst von Plener, *Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart, Leipzig, 1911, 1921), II, pp. 204, 206, 283-4, 418.

small peasantry, students and to some extent the better-paid workers—found their political expression in nationalism.[13] Among the nationalist Austro-Germans, liberalism came to be considered as something nationally effete, socially corrupt and politically reactionary, and to be identified with the privileged classes. Schönerer was not alone among nationalists in attacking liberalism and in urging the enfranchisement of the workers and a Bismarckian policy of social legislation in the interests of the less fortunate classes of the nation. He distinguished himself by his demagogic attacks on movable capital and high finance, both of which he usually identified with the Jews, and by his vigorous defence of the interests of "the honest working folk," by which he meant, as his speeches indicated, the peasantry and the lower middle class.[14] He thus gave expression to the feelings of those classes in Lower Austria, and in particular in Vienna, which, in the absence of a national foe, such as the Czechs in Bohemia, found the scapegoat for all social evils in the German-speaking Jew in their midst.

While Schönerer's primary concern was to find a solution for the peasants' indebtedness and the decline of the artisanry and small business man, his interest in the welfare of the working class proper was secondary and arose out of his fear of social revolution and his hostility to socialism. This is the note that runs through all his speeches. Until the end of the eighties socialism was illegal in Austria, but not without influence among the working people. Great strikes rocked Austrian industry; anarchist violence instilled fear into the hearts of employers and owners; Count Taaffe's pale imitation of Bismarck's "sugar and whip" policy had hardly begun to solve the pressing social problem in Austria. Even while socialism was an underground movement, rent by schism, Schönerer perceived the significance of the rise of a class-conscious proletariat, organized on a socialist, international basis, and set forth the best method of combating this new political force. He warned in the Austrian Parliament in 1884:

> There exists a disproportion, a gulf, so to speak, between different classes of the population, and it is hopelessness that is driving many workers, many an artisan and even members of the peasantry into the arms of social democracy. . . . For it is a fact that the class of workers, the working people, on an average do not secure nowadays a decent working wage and, further, do not possess, like the members of other classes, a legally assured minimum of existence. Let us therefore proceed quickly to the solution of this problem, and let us not wait

[13]Cf. *ibid.*, and Kolmer, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 14.

[14]His speeches are collected in Herwig, *op. cit.*, III.

until it is too late and until perhaps the worker in a practical way sets about answering this question; for in that case a struggle might easily develop, more cruel and devastating than any combat ever fought out in Europe.[15]

Two years earlier Schönerer had indicated the sole means of averting a social revolution and of preserving the existing social order: a reconciliation of capital and labour.[16] Nationalism was, in his eyes, an instrument for diminishing conflict between the classes of the nation and for hindering the solidarity of workers of various nationalities in Austria, for justifying moderate social reforms and averting the danger of socialism or communism. Nationalism was a weapon in the struggle against "liberalism" and "Jewish capital" on the one hand, and against international socialism on the other.

The similarity of these views with those of Hitler and National Socialism is striking. The reader of *Mein Kampf* is led to believe that Hitler's creed was largely shaped by the five years spent in Vienna, during which he lived in great poverty, came into contact with Marxist socialism, and learned to admire the social policy of the anti-semitic Mayor of Vienna, Karl Lueger. He then formed (in his own words) a "*Weltanschauung* which became the granite foundation for my present actions," to which "I have had to add but little," and which "I have not had to alter."[17] If this can be taken as an approximation to the truth, Hitler's dislike of Jews and of socialism, his advocacy of moderate social reforms and of a nationalist workers' party, his distaste for the proletariat and sympathy with the middle classes, his appreciation of the importance of a mass movement, all must be considered as products, at least in part, of his Austrian experiences. By the time of his arrival in Vienna, Lueger's popularity was at its height and Schönerer's star had waned, so that Hitler was naturally more impressed by Lueger's tactics, and more critical of Schönerer's. There can be little doubt, however, that the social philosophy as well as the racial anti-semitism of Schönerer exerted great influence on the passions and prejudices of the young Hitler.[18]

In conclusion, something must be said of the attitude of Schönerer, as a German nationalist, to the other nationalities of the monarchy, to Austria itself and to the German Reich. It was, of course, no accident that the rise of German nationalism in

[15]Herwig, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 155-9.

[16]*Ibid.*, pp. 67-74.

[17]*Mein Kampf*, p. 21; cf. p. 137 (Eng. ed., p. 30 and p. 162).

[18]For all this, see *Mein Kampf*, pp. 21 ff. (Eng. ed., pp. 30 ff.), where Hitler discusses at length the Schönerer and Lueger movements.

Austria coincided with the rise of the Czechs in economic, political, and cultural strength. As long as Austria retained a thoroughly Germanized and centralized social and political structure, and as long as the non-German nationalities, in particular the Czechs, remained in a state of cultural quietude and political and economic subjection, no national conflict was generated, and the Austrian Germans, secure in their hegemony, could assume an "Austrian" state-first political complexion; their nationalism subordinated nation to state, their liberalism involved no challenge to existing institutions, and their loyalty to Austria and the Hapsburgs was impeccable. With the steady encroachment by the non-Germans on the long-established privileges of the Germans, and the growth of radical nationalism among the Czech middle classes, nationalism began to develop among the German middle classes, especially in regions such as Bohemia and Styria where the relations of Slav and German in a single province promoted conflict, or in Lower Austria and its capital, Vienna, toward which a steady flow of Czech artisans and workers, seeking better livelihood, moved.

In the case of the Bohemian Germans, nationalism led them to oppose the Czech demand for Bohemian autonomy and to urge the greatest possible territorial and administrative separation of the two nationalities, with the establishment of a "closed" German administrative area along the frontiers of Bohemia. To a limited extent this nationalism on the periphery was covertly pan-German, seeking ultimate union with their fellow-Germans across the mountains.[19] In the case of the Germans in the heart of the Monarchy, Vienna, in the predominantly German province of Lower Austria, and in Styria, with its large Slovene minority, the idea of administrative "partition" or separation was looked upon as a cowardly retreat; theirs was a more aggressive nationalism, urging the complete Germanization of all parts of Austria that could still be saved for Germandom, including the purely Slav regions of Bohemia, Moravia, and Styria.[20] On the other hand, these Germans of the interior were ready to recognize as lost to Germandom those parts of the Monarchy overwhelmingly non-German in character and territorially detached from the main corpus of the state (Galicia, Bukowina, Dalmatia, and Hungary) and hoped, by excluding these regions from the Austrian half of the Monarchy, to facilitate the Germanization of the remainder.

[19]This was the tone of the Reichenberg daily, *Deutsche Volkszeitung*, from 1885 onward.

[20]Cf. Molisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-4, 177.

Among the German nationalists of the interior, Schönerer distinguished himself chiefly by the ruthlessness with which he proposed the de-nationalization of the non-Germans in the provinces formerly belonging to the German Federation, including, of course, Bohemia and Moravia, and by the pan-German conclusions which he drew from the above arguments. Long before the adoption of the name Pan-German (*Alldeutsch*) by his party in 1901, and the amendment of the Linz programme to the effect that a federative constitutional relationship be established between the former Austrian provinces of the German Federation and the German Reich, the implications of Schönerer's nationalism were pan-German and anti-Austrian in character. By 1901 Schönerer made no secret of his belief that the solution of the German problem lay in the destruction of Austria-Hungary as a state and the reunion of the "German" provinces, including Bohemia and Moravia, with the Hohenzollern empire.[21]

It is clear from the pages of *Mein Kampf* that the writer had drunk deep at the spring of extreme German nationalism in the Hapsburg Reich. A native of the purely German province of Upper Austria, Hitler was soon faced with the fact that Austria was not a "German state," but a "nationality state," and believed that, with the aid of the Hapsburg dynasty, "the poison of foreign nationalities was eroding the body of our own nationality" and that the "Slavization of Austria" was proceeding apace.[22] In his boyhood in Upper Austria, and his youth in Vienna, he breathed the atmosphere of national strife and had imprinted on his mind the slogans and catchwords of contemporary nationalist propaganda. Thus in the third chapter of *Mein Kampf* he writes of the life-and-death struggle of the Germans of Austria, of the conscious attempts of the Hapsburgs and their governments to extirpate Germandom in Austria and to establish a Slav state in Central Europe, of the de-Germanization of the capital city, Vienna, "the embodiment of incest," "a racial Babylon,"[23] and so on. "The longer I stayed in this city, the more my hatred rose against this foreign mixture of peoples that was beginning to eat away this old site of German culture."[24] Like Schönerer, Hitler

[21]Cf. Molisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 151, 210-11.
[22]*Mein Kampf*, pp. 9, 13 (Eng. ed., pp. 15, 20-1).
[23]*Ibid.*, pp. 135, 138 (Eng. ed., pp. 160, 163).
[24]*Ibid.*, p. 135 (Eng. ed., p. 160).

came to believe that "the hour of the collapse of this state" would be "the beginning of the salvation of the German nation."[25]

* * * * *

The foregoing has indicated the nature of Austrian German nationalism, in particular that of Schönerer, during the eighties, and its influence on the political outlook of Adolf Hitler. It is not sought to establish more than an indirect connection between the events of the eighties which are described and the development of the Hitler who grew to manhood in the subsequent two decades. Nor is it intended to prove that National Socialism is a *purely* Austrian product, or that Hitler's *Weltanschauung* was fully developed by the time of his arrival in Munich in 1912 or 1913. It may, however, be concluded that there were Austrian as well as Prussian seeds of National Socialism and that any solution of the "German problem" which interprets Nazi-ism as a purely Prussian product will not be based on solid foundations. On the other hand, it does not necessarily follow from what has been said that the Germans of the south are incapable of democratic behaviour and are naturally or traditionally inclined towards National Socialism. On the contrary, there were important elements among the Germans of Austria-Hungary which bitterly opposed nationalism of the Schönerer brand, and it remained a minority movement down to the collapse of the Monarchy. There are, then, traditions among south as well as north Germans bitterly hostile to the political philosophy of a Schönerer or a Hitler.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 136; cf. pp. 14, 105 (Eng. ed., p. 161; cf. pp. 21-2, 123).

"O FRANCE! THY BLEEDING BODY . . .": A PROTEST

GEORGE V. FERGUSON

I SHOULD like to have five cents for every time I have read these words in the past year. I should be able to retire. I have not been given this vast sum and I therefore address myself and this protest to my fellow citizens, more particularly those charged with the teaching of English in this country and those whose duty it is, by exercise of the function of criticism, to tell the truth to Canadian poets, if nine-tenths of the persons who string verses together (and too often get them published) can be so called.

Accepting the definition hereinabove given, I beg to state that there are far too many poets in this country and most of them should be destroyed. What can be done about these turgid word-mongers who take themselves so seriously? What can be done about these alleged literates who, with a mediocre talent for rhyme-making, can allow no event in the world's history to take place without seizing pen or pencil and dashing off something that inevitably begins with the words "O France," "O Poland," "O Norway," "O Holland," or "O Greece, thy bleeding body," and ends after tedious and interminable delay with some sentiment that, translated into honest prose, means that it is too bad France, Poland or Norway fell. There ought to be a law.

I have sat at an editor's desk now for some twenty-two months of war and unless that law is passed, or something, I cannot be held responsible for the consequences. War has lent wings to the practice of so-called poesy. In it pours, day after day:—"Dear Sir, I enclose a sonnet (14 lines) on Winston Churchill which I have been working on for some weeks now. . . ." Or, "Dear Sir, Enclosed please find a poem on the fall of France which I would be pleased to allow you to publish. . . ." Or, "Dear Sir, I am sure your readers would be interested in my ode to General de Gaulle which I am offering to no other paper in your territory. . . ." Or, "Dear Sir, In days such as these when everything possible must be done to arouse the people to the dire needs of the present crisis I enclose (Hold your hat. Here she comes) a poem on the recent tragic events in France. . . ." O France, thy bleeding body!

These things have been pouring in upon every editor's desk in an unending stream. At the moment of writing, most of the poets

are working on the bombing of London . . . (O London, thy bleeding body). The war is bad enough without it. In the last war there was an infantry battalion called "The Artists' Rifles." Some such scheme designed to attract poets might bring surcease.

Would it not be possible, through some special course of instruction or guidance, to put a stop to this kind of thing? Some gentle suggestion from quarters that are respected by poets might do the trick. Some hint that only one person in more than a million has really got a talent worth developing. Some quiet word, dropped here and there in serious magazines devoted to the cause of letters, that people only make themselves ridiculous when they try to beat out topical poetry. Some slight history of the lamentable course of the British Poets Laureate might be helpful. Anything would be helpful, but it must come from a source that these alleged poets respect.

That is what makes it useless for a newspaper editor in himself to do anything about it. Poets do not respect newspaper editors. They attempt only to make use of them. Newspaper editors represent some channel through which publication may be possible. But poets despise them, as witness their rage when the hard-pressed editor takes the ode to Churchill and sticks it in the *Letters to the Editor* column instead of publishing it in special type on the front or editorial page of their sheet. We have no illusions, we of the Fourth Estate, regarding the place we hold in the hearts of the poets of Canada. It is the tiniest and vilest niche. We are only instruments whereby, as a result of the social injustice of the world, poets can get space. In a better-ordered world, of course, poets would have a prescriptive right to front-page space in any organ and as often as they wanted it.

Editors, it is only fair to say, are partly to blame for the torrent of verse that reaches their desks daily. Every now and again they use some of it, and each occasion is the signal for a new and overwhelming onslaught. It leads one to the belief that there is some infectious bacteria in the veins of most of our hundreds of thousands of Canadian poets. This bacteria becomes active when its possessor sees verse in print, and out comes more of the same in a typewritten torrent. To protect these persons against themselves, it would be well not to publish any verse at all. But that would be bad, for every millionth poem may be good. Alas, editors do not always choose the good verse and the reason for

this, though technically rational, is a vitiating factor in the general scheme of things. Verse is too often chosen because of its length. Hilaire Belloc once discussed this. He had, he said, often seen editors at work. The typographical make-up of various pages was difficult. A small hole might be left in one corner, and the editor, turning to a sub-editor, says to the latter, "Have you got a poem handy in type?" "What kind of poem?" asks the subservient and weak-kneed sub-editor. "A two-inch poem," replies the editor, and out of a galley of dreary type is drawn a poem for publication —not because of its merit, not because of its content of thought. No. Its sole value to the editor is that it is exactly two inches long. An inch shorter or half an inch longer would forever ruin that poem's sole chance of immortality, and I hope that this bald, well-known fact carries its lesson to whatever poets may be reading these words. Not long ago Mr B. K. Sandwell of *Saturday Night* made an appeal to poets. He said—for some reason unknown to me—that he welcomed contributions of poetry. But he pleaded with his poets so to build their lines that he could publish them in single-column space, instead of double-column space. The inference of this plea is of course quite clear. Poetry, to be valuable to *Saturday Night* (which has these special make-up problems to which I have referred) must have just so many words of average length per line. This seems to make the poetic process somewhat mechanical, which might have the tendency of making a poet replace such a phrase as "magic casements opening on the foam," by "windows on the front." Mr Sandwell, if he is not lucky, may defeat his own ends.

But all editors do not use poems only because of their length or lack of it. They set themselves up every so often—I speak frankly—as judges of verse. I make the excuse for them that they are hurried men. But most of them, hurried or not, are not judges of verse. They suddenly get a random notion that they think a submitted poem is good, and in she goes with a minimum of thought and maximum of later regret, for the flood-gates, as I have previously remarked, immediately open. Editors, if they are wise, will never publish verse in daily newspapers. The attendant grief is not worth it. So long as they do, they will get what is coming to them. Verse, it is my firm conviction, should be published only in periodicals dedicated solely to verse. If the poets themselves are unable to keep it alive, a small government grant or an insignifi-

cant levy on the Community Chest would subsidize it successfully. I will say for poets that I know hardly any of them that are on the make. They don't ask much, if they ask for money at all.

But there is another constructive suggestion that might be made here. It is that Canada's real poets, of which there are some by all accounts, should place upon themselves a self-denying ordinance forbidding them to write topical verse. Unless they feel that they have found no less than a unique form of words in which to enshrine some really useful observation upon such subjects as the fall of France, they should not put pen to paper. Most rhymesters unfortunately, even those with a talent for words, have most ordinary minds. Their thoughts are commonplace; and if the content of the poem is commonplace, it takes a truly magical gift of words to raise what is written out of the class of dub performances. Canada's real poets therefore should think twice or thrice before setting down their views upon the passing world.

To this the reply may be made that there is no reason why poets should not inscribe their sadly average thoughts when editorial writers do so daily, with nothing more to offer in the way of content and an even more meagre gift of language. This thought, let me assure my readers, is seldom absent from the minds of editorial writers. A distinguished Canadian journalist has often spoken of what he calls "basswood" editorials,—editorials of soft and ill-kept material, sawed off in chunks to meet daily needs. But an editorial writer, if he does not do well the first time can try again and again to achieve something better. He is a poor fellow doing his best, day by day, to provide something that will keep his readers going until they can get something better. Poets, I hope, are not in this class. They meet a more discriminating demand. Caviar must be good. Corned-beef hash can be ordinary. And lastly the editorial writer has a job. Writing is his profession. He has to write, whether he wants to or not. This is not the case with poets. They earn their living at other, more reputable, crafts. Their poetry is a side-line. No grim need of providing bread for babies urges them to take their pens in hand. They write, and they submit their writing to editors, because they have a first-rate sensation that they have knocked out something colossal. In this they are mistaken, and if the teachers of English, whom I have been led to believe they respect, would just tip them off firmly and not too gently in this respect, this Canada of ours could be made without much delay a better place to live in.

REVIEWS

EUROPEAN POETRY*

FELIX WALTER

"To see European literature through British eyes is not always to have the best perspective. The distortion is likely to be considerable in regard to the poetry of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in which the chief movements were French and German and the greatest figure was not British. Yet since English is the first, and because of language barriers frequently the only, European poetry known to them, Americans are disposed to accept English opinion of its relative importance. Nevertheless, Americans, drawing blood and culture from every race in Europe but greatly removed by geography, institutions, and history, should be able, if language barriers were surmounted, to appraise European poetry with detached impartiality."

This Emersonian declaration of independence gives the key to Professor Neff's ably written guide to the modern poetry of four branches of western European culture,—the English, the French, the German, and the Italian. And the American point of view which pervades his book frequently provides some of the more original passages. Embarking on an explanation of the philhellenism of over a century ago, for instance, Professor Neff writes ingeniously: "If the Appalachians and the Rockies had set up a barrier to the north winds by running east and west like the Alps, Americans could better comprehend the yearning of Northern Europeans for Mediterranean lands. When we have adjusted our minds to the evidence of the atlas that Germany and England are in the latitude of Labrador and that New York has the sun of Constantinople and Naples, we, who take for granted pellucid skies, are prepared to envisage the land of Winckelmann."

But if Professor Neff, from his American vantage-point has managed to slough off many purely "British" prejudices in his estimate of the continental poets, it is perhaps too much to expect that he cease to be what we clumsily call "Anglo-Saxon" in certain of his views. Particularly in his treatment of the poets of France ghosts from the cemetery of Victorian criticism are allowed to

*_A Revolution in European Poetry, 1660-1900_, by Emery Neff, Columbia University Press, pp. xi, 279, $3.00.

walk again: in phrases like the "strait-jacket of Malherbe," in the curious belief that French writers never read the Bible before Chateaubriand arrived on the scene, in the notion that the French cannot write mystical poetry, or in the suggestion that Byron became so popular on the continent because his poetry was easy to translate.

Professor Neff also appears to suffer to some extent from the professional disability of a lifetime spent in fruitful scholarship in the field of nineteenth-century English literature. This may explain why Wordsworth seems to emerge as the real hero of his book—though Goethe, Arnold and Leopardi may follow close behind—and could at the same time account for the curious foreshortening of his study at either end. For the period 1660-1770 is scampered over in thirty-five pages with scant justice to any poet but Dryden, while the journey ends abruptly at the threshold of our own century, precisely at the moment when the real revolution in European poetry was getting under way.

But Professor Neff's comparative study is valuable in many ways. It integrates a period of astonishing diversity and a galaxy of highly individualized poets with great skill. It provides a carefully chosen anthology of some of the best of modern European poetry with accurate if prosaic translations by the compiler. It does not allow the giants and the geniuses to shoulder the so-called "minor" poets right out into the cold; indeed the discussions of poets such as Hölderlin, Novalis and Leconte de Lisle are among the best in the book. And, as far as the central core is concerned, only one significant lesser light—Swinburne—is slighted and only one other—Sainte-Beuve—left out altogether (a curious omission for a Wordsworthian!). Most remarkable of all, Professor Neff has managed to steer his reader skilfully through the mazes of the birth of the class struggle in modern poetry, the poetic conflict with industrialization and modern science, and an era of nature worship, without once falling back on those completely demonetized terms "classical" and "romantic." Finally, Professor Neff's book is everywhere infused with the consciousness that the successive strata of our cultural heritage can never be properly understood if they are artificially broken up along national lines. Western European literature is a homogeneous entity and such concepts as "English literature" or "French literature" are too often a mere convenience for pedagogues stranded on the island of a single language.

BACKGROUND FOR MILTON*

A. S. P. Woodhouse

The beginnings of Puritanism belong to the period of the Reformation and the Elizabethan settlement. Though hostile, as a movement, to tradition, and also in a sense to development, Puritanism rapidly builds its own tradition and, at the same time, manifests its extraordinary powers of growth and change. No one who ignores its earlier phases can possibly understand the tangle of conflicting strains which form so important a part of Milton's background. We are fortunate in now having an authoritative account of those earlier phases in Professor M. M. Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism*. Book I provides a chronological narrative with special emphasis on the evolution of Puritan political theory. Commencing with Tyndale and the continental background, it traces the history of the English reformers at home and abroad through the troubled years from Henry's divorce to Elizabeth's accession, with due attention to the seeds of Puritanism sown among the exiles, especially at Frankfort, the headway made by the Genevan model and its propagandists, and the emergence of Congregationalism, "another revolutionary technique." Then, with an account of the Elizabethan settlement and the scruples of ultra-Protestants respecting it, the history of Puritanism proper gets under way—the term itself first appearing in the vestiarian controversy (1567)—and we are led through the main developments of Elizabeth's reign: the organization of a Presbyterian party, its unsuccessful effort to capture Parliament for its own ends (a valuable rehearsal for 1640), the attempt of the Bishops to control

**Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*, by M. M. Knappen, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Beginning of the English Reformation . . . to the Restoration, by W. K. Jordan, London and Toronto, George Allen and Unwin; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 4 vols.

Milton in the Puritan Revolution, by Don M. Wolfe, New York, London, Toronto, Thomas Nelson and Sons.

Milton's Literary Milieu, by George Wesley Whiting, Chapel Hill, N.C., University of North Carolina Press.

An Index to the Columbia Edition of the Works of John Milton, by Frank Allen Patterson (assisted by French Rowe Fogle), New York, Columbia University Press, 2 vols.

and guide the Puritans within the Church, the advent of Separatism, the strong measures of Whitgift and the decline of Puritan aggressiveness as an open menace to the settlement. The story is told with a wealth of detail from original sources, which yet never obscures the essential pattern. Already Professor Knappen receives our unqualified gratitude, which takes practical shape in the hope that he will go on to tell the more complex story of Puritanism under the Stuarts. But the present volume has further benefits to confer. Book II is devoted to a descriptive analysis of the intellectual, social and cultural bearings of Tudor Puritanism, which is as valuable and as skilful as the preceding narrative. Though the evidence is all drawn from the period before his birth, this is the tradition which Milton inherited. No student of the poet, or of his century, should fail to read these sane and penetrating chapters or to profit by the interesting exercise in comparison which they will set him.

Not less important in itself, nor less useful for the student of Milton, is Professor Jordan's *Development of Religious Toleration in England*, whose first volume covers the same period as Professor Knappen's book and offers a valuable supplement to it. The method here employed is one that, with minor adaptations, will serve Professor Jordan for his whole work. First we have a chronological survey of the period under discussion. This is presented from the standpoint of the party in power and thus permits a summary of the opinion of the dominant group—in this case, "Anglican and governmental opinion," leading up to a brief examination of Hooker. The foundation thus firmly laid, Professor Jordan can deal with other groups, largely by summaries of their leading authors: the Presbyterians (to whom Professor Jordan, unlike Professor Knappen and most other modern writers, unwisely restricts the term Puritan); the Separatists; the Roman Catholics; and a miscellaneous collection of writers described as Lay and Moderate, on which his thesis demands a very heavy emphasis, and whose mark he holds to be a predominantly secular outlook. A very important example is Jacobus Acontius, whose *Satanae Stratagemata* continued to exercise its influence for a hundred years. Professor Jordan's admirable section on Acontius takes the opportunity to introduce other continental figures such as Castellion and Ochino. In the second volume (1603-40) the account of dominant Anglican opinion has to be extended to include the rise

of Anglo-Catholicism as contrasted with moderate or traditional churchmanship. If one is startled to find Andrewes and Ussher classified together, and Arminius set down as predominantly secular in outlook, there are further shocks in store in the last two volumes. These are really one and are devoted to the rich diversity of the years 1640-60. Here the dominant group from whose standpoint the chronological narrative is written is Presbyterian for 1640-8, and Independent for 1648-60 (where Professor Jordan gives a useful analysis of the policy of Cromwell). There follow, with slight adaptations, the usual summaries of opinion: Presbyterian (with a valuable distinction between the irreconcilables, as Professor Jordan calls the Scottish Commissioners and their disciples, and the moderate Presbyterians, whose finest example is Baxter); Sectarian, Independent and Baptist; Anglican, now forced to descend from its lofty place and learn the need for toleration in a bitter school; the views of Laymen and Moderates, more than ever a motley crew, including the Cambridge Platonists (who would deeply have resented the charge of secularism), the Erastians (with Prynne and Hobbes in uncomfortable proximity), the Rationalists and Sceptics (and in their midst the author of *Paradise Lost*). A final chapter looks back over the whole vast sweep and gives us Professor Jordan's conclusions.

While recognizing the contribution to the theory of religious liberty made not only by the sectarian groups but by the Anglican Church, Professor Jordan throws the chief emphasis on the growth of secularism, with its ultimate indifference to the warfare of dogmatists and perhaps to religion itself. This he pronounces to have been the commanding and inescapable movement of History, an abstract person in whose presence we always feel a vague alarm. We now understand why, from the first, supposedly "secular" thinkers, of the most diverse kinds, were herded together in Professor Jordan's summaries, but we remain sceptical. An ultimate tendency to secularism is one thing; the terms in which these writers develop their ideas, quite another. It is not less the historian's business to report the terms than to bring out the tendency. In Professor Jordan's long summaries we often suspect that his sense of the tendency obscures for him and for us the writers' conscious argument and robs of force and freshness their treatment of ideas that were the special possession of their age. Professor Jordan's ordering of his material, admirable in its lucidity, demands

much more cross-reference than he supplies between writers placed in widely different categories. Obviously Milton, to give a single example, has affinities with John Goodwin and Roger Williams as well as with the Cambridge Platonists and the materialist Overton. But taken as a whole the book is a storehouse of information on a subject of immense historical importance, in which Milton has his place; and the pages devoted to the poet are, if not exhaustive, still sound and stimulating.

Mr Don Wolfe's *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* may be regarded as an effort to bring the revolution to a focus in Milton or, conversely, to give Milton his proper setting in the revolution. In each view it meets with a measure of success. But there is a certain aloofness in Milton even as a pamphleteer. He tends to take his own way with public questions, and superficially at least he presents more contrasts with his fellows than similarities. Especially will this appear if one does not deal firmly with the doctrinal bases of his argument and theirs. Nor indeed will comparison, or contrast either, be of much significance unless pursued on a level to which Mr Wolfe rarely penetrates. He gives much attention to the radicals, Lilburne, Walwyn and Winstanley, and tells us how Milton differs from them in opinion (and they from each other), but not why. More profitable comparisons might have been discovered with the Independents, Ireton and John Goodwin. The chapters devoted specifically to Milton are (within the limitation already suggested) among the best: we are made to comprehend very clearly the evolution of his opinion regarding one-man rule, the masses, and Parliament. Mr Wolfe has a wide acquaintance with the pamphlet literature of the period and shows considerable skill in opening up chronological sequences of fact, interesting in themselves, but often very remotely connected with Milton. In the appendices he reprints four or five specimen pamphlets inaccessible to the average student, thus joining Professor Haller and the present reviewer in their effort to illustrate the thought of the Puritan Revolution from primary sources.

Mr George Whiting's *Milton's Literary Milieu* fulfils the promise of its title only partially and indirectly, providing some evidence on the subject indeed but making no attempt at a comprehensive picture or at any generalized conclusions. The book consists of a number of special studies, such as might qualify for inclusion in the learned journals, from which in fact some of them

are here collected. The only unity discoverable resides not in the subject but in Mr Whiting's aim and method. His thesis is that the source-hunters pursue their task in too narrow a spirit—and anyway in nearly all of their supposed discoveries they are wrong; what one should do is to seek not sources, but analogues. With this thesis one may heartily concur and yet be disquieted by Mr Whiting's own procedure. His method indeed is scarcely distinguishable from that of the source-hunter except that it permits the inclusion of more irrelevant matter: he deals largely in the deadly parallel but is often content with less resemblance than will serve as evidence of immediate borrowing. Taking in hand Raleigh's *History of the World*, Mercator's *Atlas*, St Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* with Vives' commentary, and other books that Milton knew, Mr Whiting drags us hither and thither in *Paradise Lost* and exclaims with triumph when he finds them dealing with the same subjects. In the course of this protracted and not very exhilarating exercise, one acquires (supposing one does not already possess it) some acquaintance with works which formed a part of Milton's literary background, but usually with their treatment of isolated themes, not with their general tenor. Of greater value is the emergence from time to time of new points very useful for the annotation of the poem: elucidations and even possible sources of Milton's phrases. For after sources Mr Whiting plainly hankers, despite his disclaimers. "You cannot so inoculate the old stock but we shall relish of it." At last in his study of *Eikonoklastes* he throws off the mask and boldly asserts against all comers, no doubt correctly, that Milton made extensive use of Thomas May's *History of the Parliament of England*. But before reaching that point—for inexplicably he keeps the prose till the end—he has devoted chapters of varying length, worth and tediousness, to the detail of Milton's account of the creation, Eden, the pagan deities, to his melancholy temper viewed in the light of Burton's *Anatomy*, to some farfetched analogues of *Comus* in the *Praise of Folly* and some extremely commonplace resemblances to *Samson* in Quarles's worthless poem, to a comparison of Bacon and Milton (of almost breath-taking superficiality), to a valuable note on what the Puritans meant by Belial, and to other matters. That Mr Whiting provides a good deal of material for the study of Milton's literary background may be gratefully affirmed. But so do even the least self-conscious of the source-hunters. (May their shadow never

grow less!) They work under their own rigorous if artificial discipline, the discipline of the deadly parallel. If one is to go beyond them and deal in the more fruitful theme of analogues, another discipline is required, the discipline of ideas. One must formulate with the utmost precision the essential character of Milton's ideas on the creation, the Church, the story of Samson, whatever it may be, or in another field, the essential quality and effect of his images. Only then can one proceed to illuminating comparison and contrast with the writers he may have read, and in providing material for the study of his background also suggest his relation to it.

We come finally to an indispensable instrument for the future study of Milton, and in less degree of his background as well, the new *Columbia Index* to his writings. There are concordances for our chief poets (including two old ones for Milton, and Miss Lockwood's original and very useful *Lexicon*); there are indices for some of our prose writers (including that in the Bohn edition of Milton's prose, probably the worst index ever made). But for no other English writer does there exist such an instrument as Professor Patterson has here fashioned; and for few others is there need of one. For Milton the need, though heretofore unappreciated, was very great because his poetry and prose are both so extensive, so packed with ideas and allusions, and so intimately related.

The *Index* runs to over 2,100 closely printed pages and contains more than 170,000 entries. There are, to take some random examples, 46 pages on God (and god), 15 on Milton, and 12 on liberty and freedom. Professor Patterson's object has been to give the student every conceivable aid in running down the passage required, in prose or verse, and further to place at his disposal as much as possible of the vast and detailed knowledge of Milton built up in producing the Columbia edition of his *Works*. The method is in some degree eclectic. In very many instances Professor Patterson has completed or even supplied Milton's references. Not content with listing the proper names mentioned, he has added those not mentioned but recognizably alluded to; and so with biblical passages not actually quoted or cited, but merely echoed, and with the works of secular authors on which Milton has drawn without specific acknowledgment. In dealing with ideas the original plan was for an elaborate topical index with appropriate

subdivisions. The extreme difficulty, however, of discriminating and recording all the different shades of meaning, and the constant and inevitable intrusion of the compiler's personal judgment which it implied, forced the abandonment of the plan. One recognizes but cannot help regretting the necessity. For the topical index was substituted entry under the most important word, the method of the concordance. This may seem too mechanical, but an index is a machine; and it has two great advantages: it enables the compiler to indicate something of the context, and the student to run down all passages possibly required and make up his own mind about them. Characteristically Professor Patterson has preferred utility to complete consistency and has added some passages where the idea is present without the actual word. Thus, to illustrate, you will find under the heading *Liberty* an enormous number of phrases in which the word is present, and some few where the word is absent but the idea present. The order of the entries is that of occurrence in the *Columbia Milton* (though the *Index* can fairly satisfactorily be used with other editions). There are no subdivisions, such as *Christian liberty*, *civil liberty*, *religious liberty;* but the informed student will be quick to turn to these adjectives, and he will not be disappointed. For others a cross-reference might profitably have been added. As is proper, the great *Index* is an invitation to study and thought, not a mere labour-saving device. For the gigantic effort, the loving care and the practical good sense that have gone to its making every student of Milton must be profoundly grateful, and in them he may find a model and an inspiration.

CHRISTIANITY AND CLASSICAL CULTURE*

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

A reviewer of books is not frequently embarrassed by the fear that his appreciation may seem too extravagant; but that is the fear which assails me as I seek to express my opinion of a book which has given me more unalloyed pleasure than anything I have read

**Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*, by Charles Norris Cochrane [Professor of Ancient History, University College, Toronto], Oxford University Press, $9.00.

in the past decade. This historical study of "thought and action from Augustus to Augustine" is a masterpiece. First of all it is truly a study of "thought and action" because the historian has mastered the thought of the classical world as thoroughly as he knows the movement of political and social events in the Roman Empire.

Even if the book were not a profound analysis and comparison of the classical and the Christian approach to life—that is, if the second half of the volume were entirely eliminated—it would still be a unique and distinguished study of the relation of the mind of classicism to the tragic events of a declining Rome, and a brilliant exposition of the thesis that what confronts us in the decline of Rome "is, in the last analysis, a moral and intellectual failure, a failure of the Graeco-Roman mind." I know of no history of this period of Roman culture which brings the thought of a Vergil, a Cicero, a Livy and a Plutarch into such relevance to the policies of statesmen and emperors as does this study. Nor is the thesis about the failure of the Roman mind stressed to the point of obscuring other factors in the decline of Rome. The analysis of the purposes and policies of the Augustan principate, for instance, reveals to what degree the empire overcame chaotic tendencies in republican-aristocratic Rome by policies which achieved a new unity and a higher justice but which had the seeds of ultimate decay within them. One recognizes the fatefulness of a policy which narrows the base of political authority in order to broaden the basis of political justice and imperial unity. It restores the health of the commonwealth at the expense of making its death more inevitable in the long run. Though Mr Cochrane does not point the moral or make explicit comparisons with our own day, one is struck by disturbing analogies with current political history, to the point of wondering whether he has not placed his finger upon a form of decay which operates without reference to the limitations of a classical culture and which may be repeating itself in the history of our own democratic civilization.

As for the basic thesis, that Roman decay was a revelation of the inability of the classical mind to come to grips with novel trends in history because its conception of *scientia* either reduced history to the uniformities of nature or raised it to the level of pure reason, I know of no historical treatise which has elaborated this criticism so brilliantly. As a matter of fact, modern culture has itself

oscillated between Platonism and naturalism to such a degree, embracing either one or the other horn of the classical dilemma, that this historical study could have been written only by one who is no longer bound by the presuppositions of the traditional culture of our day. Professor Cochrane's criticisms of Cicero, for instance, are applicable with few reservations to most of the "liberals" of our epoch, though again he does not make this comparison, even if one may suspect him of having them in mind occasionally. Ciceronian classicism and modern liberalism make the common mistake of assuming that political life easily conforms to its ideal principles and that to state principles of justice is in effect to realize them.

Professor Cochrane's basic criticism of the classical mind is that its fundamental categories are unable to comprehend the realities of history. Whether it thinks in terms of mind or matter, of the causal chains of nature or of rational forms as the ultimate reality, it cannot deal with the uniqueness of the historical occasion or comprehend the freedom of human personality as it acts in history. History is, as a matter of fact, a curious compound of freedom and fate, which can be given meaning only in terms of some concept of providence which the classical mind cannot achieve. The Roman *fortuna* and the Greek *tyche* are, therefore, constantly subject to alternate interpretations which reduce the elements in history, beyond the control of the individual, either to an iron determinism or to pure caprice. In the one case the rationality of history is reduced to mechanism, which means that it is robbed of essential meaning. In the other case the irrational element in history overwhelms the concept of meaning. Stated in another way, there is no possibility of having a creative philosophy of history if meaningfulness is equated with rationality in either the idealistic or naturalistic sense.

Philosophers of history have analysed this problem before, but I know of no contemporary philosopher of history who has the command of detailed historical data to do what Professor Cochrane has done, which is to trace the practical influence of these defects in a philosophy upon the policies of statesmen and the history of an empire.

The vantage point from which the classical mind is criticized is that of Augustinian philosophy, though before Professor Cochrane arrives at Augustine he treats us to a remarkably astute historical

analysis of pre-Augustinian Christian history, including the quasi-Platonism of Origen, the anti-rationalism of Tertullian (is Karl Barth the modern counterpart?), and the superficial and sentimental compound of politics and Christian morals in Constantine's clerical apologists.

Perhaps before going on to Professor Cochrane's discussion of Augustine it may be wise to say that I thought the book a most remarkable one before I had arrived at this treatment of Augustine. It was remarkable in distinction to all the analyses of Roman decline which have no real vantage point from which to view that decline because they are themselves based upon essentially classical presuppositions. But I hardly dared hope that Augustine would be understood so profoundly and that what is essential would be distinguished from what is peripheral in his thought with such fine discrimination. I had not dared to hope this because the religious world is only beginning to emerge from the arid wastes of a rationalized and sentimentalized Christianity, to appreciate Augustine. Why should a greater appreciation be expected in an historian and a philosopher?

Yet this is what we have in Professor Cochrane's book. It is a saner appreciation of the profundities of Augustine's great system of thought than most theologians could write because it has its eye upon what is essential and is not lost in theological minutiae. We see the importance of the doctrine of "original sin" as a basic category for the interpretation of history. We are helped to recognize the emphasis upon "grace" in Augustine's thought as a revelation of Christianity's understanding for the problem of power, vitality, and will in life as against the tendency to equate virtue with "form" or "order" or "ratio," in both classical and modern culture. Thus the confession of St. Paul, "to will is present with me but how to perform that which is good I find not," is again given the significance it deserves in interpreting human behaviour and the problems of human history. The whole discussion of Augustinian psychology, with its understanding of the essential unity of the rational and the volitional life of man, is profound.

Perhaps most remarkable of all is the understanding of the author for the relevance of Christian Trinitarianism to the interpretation of history. He writes, "In the Trinity, Christian wisdom discovers that for which Classicism had so long vainly sought, viz., the *logos* or explanation of Being and motion, in other words a

metaphysic of ordered process." The reason this is so is that in the Trinitarian conception of God, the God who is revealed in history (Christ) and the God who transcends history (the Father) are recognized as equally God, though there is a slight emphasis, at least by implication, upon the priority of God the Father from whom the Son proceeds. Professor Cochrane sees, as no other historian to my knowledge understands, that the hair-splitting Christological controversies which preceded the Nicene definition of the Christian faith were something more than hair-splitting and really dealt with basic problems about the meaning of life and history. In the Christian definition of the ultimate, Professor Cochrane declares, Christianity "does justice to the element of truth contained alike in the claims of classical materialism and classical idealism." To understand history it is important not to regard "the body as the ultimate—i.e., the real principle of our existence as human beings"—nor yet to resolve the body, "as it was by the Platonists, into a mere 'appearance.' " This is to say, that a valid interpretation of history must take man's physical existence and his life in nature seriously on the one hand but must on the other hand realize that physical existence is not self-derived or self-explanatory or self-fulfilling. Professor Cochrane recognizes that the affirmations contained and implied in the Christian doctrine of Incarnation and Trinity, presuppose the Christian doctrine of Creation and that it is not possible to build a positive philosophy of history upon the Platonic concept of creation, according to which life comes into existence through the imposition of rational forms upon a previously given formless stuff thus "immobilizing reality and reducing it purely to terms of structure."

At one point I think I would concede more to the prejudices of the "modern mind" than Professor Cochrane seems to do. I would concede that Christian Trinitarianism is a non-Greek answer in Greek terms to the problem of the nature of Being. The Christian answer bridges the absolute gulf between the "passible" and the "impassible," between the Eternal and the natural in classical thought. It is precisely because Classical thought thinks only in terms of nature and the Eternal that it cannot understand history, which is something more than natural sequence. But to make the Christian affirmation in Greek terms involves the Christian faith in the nonsense of the distinctions about the two natures of Christ, etc.

These Christian affirmations can be made intelligible today if we concede that they are symbolic affirmations of ultimate *meaning*, but that they lack the kind of rational precision which the Nicene definition claimed for them. Christ is God, for Christian faith, not because it is possible to discern a "divine nature" curiously intermingled with a "human nature" in his person, but because in his life and death faith discerns the ultimate meaning of life, which is to say a revelation of the character of ultimate reality which transcends, and yet is involved in, the process of history.

I believe, as already suggested, that Professor Cochrane's book has a tremendous significance for the understanding of our own history, not only because there are obvious analogies between the decline of Rome and our own tragic period, but also because any profound analysis of the problem of history in any period is bound to throw light upon every period. Certainly our civilization can find no spiritual security or political peace within terms of the liberalism which has informed our democratic civilization and which failed so miserably to gauge the internal and external perils to which we have been exposed. We need a reorientation as urgently as did Roman classicism. In the broadest sense modern civilization requires an Augustinian reformulation of the problem of life and history. This reformulation cannot be the Catholic neo-Thomist version of Augustinianism because some of the dialectic of the Augustinian system is obscured in this version. Nor can it be the Reformation revival of Augustinianism because in this version the task of political justice is obscured. It will have to be more truly Augustinian than either traditional Catholicism or orthodox Protestantism; and it will certainly have to be more profound than either secular or Christian liberalism, which know literally nothing of the profound problems that engaged Augustine.

For these reasons the rediscovery of Augustine by one who is not a theological schoolman but first of all an historian and philosopher is of the greatest significance.

UNION NOW WITH BRITAIN*

F. H. SOWARD

Two years ago, Mr Clarence K. Streit, then the Geneva Correspondent of the *New York Times*, published *Union Now*, a vigorous appeal for fifteen democracies, European, British, and the United States of America, to form immediately a federal union as the only satisfactory basis for world peace. Since then all of the proposed European members have either been conquered, crippled, or circumvented by the totalitarian states. Mr Streit's newest book takes stock of these developments, and argues the case for an immediate provisional union on federal lines between the United States and the members of the British Commonwealth. The appeal is made to an American audience, and reflects the author's own crusading spirit and his experiences as a lecturer and propagandist for "Union Now." Certainly the opening sentences read more like a sales talk by Dale Carnegie than a serious treatise on world order: "Have you ever wanted to do the best you could with your life? To live supremely? Have you ever known this satisfaction? Ever had a chance to know how much you yourself can really do, how good you really are? Here is your chance."

In the main Mr Streit argues two theses, that the United States cannot escape the menace of Hitlerism by standing on the sidelines, and that it should enter into partnership with the British democracies only on the basis of federal union. It is suggested that the new union of the free should offer peace to the dictatorships on the basis "of no annexations or occupations of foreign territory, no indemnities or reparations except the return of returnable property, and the settlement by arbitration, conciliation or judicial action, of disputes that led to this war, as well as all subsequent questions that cannot be settled by direct action." Should this offer be refused, as the author thinks probable, then the United States should enter the war and the Union adopt a policy of using its land forces sparingly while it seeks to win mainly with its sea, air, and moral forces.

One of the most enlightening features of the book is the type of argument which the author adopts to secure his countrymen's approval for a new federation. It is almost precisely the one

**Union Now with Britain*, Clarence K. Streit, Jonathan Cape, 1941, $2.00.

employed by Borah and Lodge over twenty years ago in opposing American membership in a League of Nations, where the United States had one vote and the British Empire six. If the United States merely became the ally of the British Commonwealth, Mr Streit believes that his country would be under a severe handicap, since it would have only one vote in a group of seven sovereign states. To quote his words (which appear to reflect an ignorance of Irish policy to date), "By this system of nationalism so dear to the misguided Irish extremists in our midst, Eire's 3,000,000 Irishmen have the same weight in Inter-Allied Policy as 130,000,000 Americans." Even the Joint Defence Board between the United States and Canada is objected to on the same grounds as when Mr Streit, in a letter to an American Legion official, complains that in Ottawa meetings of the Board one Canadian is equal to thirteen Americans, which is manifestly unfair to the State of New York with its 12,000,000 people, and that the answer is, "Let's end this diplomatic system of governing our relations which gives the British Commonwealth six votes (one for each state), and organize them henceforth on our American Federal Union basis where representation is proportioned to the population. That would give us the majority in the Union Government." Throughout the book the author thus persistently confuses status with stature and, in spite of his Geneva experiences, fails to realize that the strength of a great power is not measured by votes alone. As wise old Balfour wrote in the famous Report of 1926: "But the principles of equality and similarity, apropos to status do not universally extend to function. Here we require something more than immutable dogmas."

Repeatedly Mr Streit insists that Federalism is the American way, which offers the only salvation for the world, and quotes from the founding fathers to show their grasp of the problem in 1787. Well versed as he is in their arguments, the author shows a noticeable unfamiliarity with federal experience elsewhere. His readers are informed that the Canadians, Australians and South Africans have adopted "our federal system," but only once, and in an annex, is a reference made to what he calls "the parliamentary system of responsive government." Nowhere is any adequate analysis made of the economic aspects of federalism, about which the ten Premiers of Canada could give him some enlightening information.

Mr Streit's ignorance of the workings of the British Commonwealth is impressive and alarming. After arguing that the maxim "divide and rule" has become second nature to the British statesmen, he asserts: "The government in London similarly holds together now, like spokes of a rimless wheel, the Commonwealth of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada and Eire. It has never sought to unite them with it in a common representative government. It still keeps Newfoundland separate from Canada." It would be difficult to find in brief compass more misconceptions of the situation than that.

In addition to his unfamiliarity with the structure of government, Mr Streit appears innocent of all knowledge of its political workings. The following examples are illustrative. His provisional congress is to have twenty-seven American members in a house of forty-nine. At the outset it is suggested that the Americans be selected by Congress from a panel submitted by the President. Among the indispensables in the list would be, in the author's opinion, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, Alfred Landon, Herbert Hoover, Al Smith, John W. Davis, James Cox, and Charles Hughes! The executive of the new union should be a Board which might be at first two consuls or tribunes, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, with the former "administering the Union's territory on this side of the Atlantic and in the Pacific, including Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Hong Kong." Then the author reflects that perhaps three might be better in the provisional period, with Mr Mackenzie King as the third or perhaps de Valera "and there would be good arguments in favour of others—say an Australian or a Frenchman or a German."

In short, this book must be recognized a tract for the times, notable for its sincerity, high in emotional content, and low in political realism.

VISIBILTY IN METEOROLOGY

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE MEASUREMENT OF THE VISUAL RANGE

by

W. E. KNOWLES MIDDLETON
M.Sc.
Meteorologist in the Meteorological Service of Canada

Second Edition
Completely revised and enlarged

$2.50

The University of Toronto Press

SELF SEAL ENVELOPES

featured in

CHATEAU Ripple STATIONERY

SOLD BY LEADING STATIONERY, DRUG AND DEPARTMENT STORES

W. J. GAGE & CO., Limited - Toronto

Sole manufacturers of Self Seal Envelopes in Canada

ENVELOPES *Plain* *Printed* *Embossed*

TORONTO ENVELOPE CO. LIMITED
366 Adelaide Street West, Toronto 2, Ont.

"The Forum has performed many useful functions during its more than two decades of life. It has maintained high standards of both style and content; it has done many a useful job of acrid criticism; it has on occasion opened it columns to men and women of letters who otherwise would have had difficulty finding their place in the limited Canadian field; it has also upheld with valiant scholarship the views of the moderate Left and of the C.C.F. in a fashion no other periodical in the country has done . . ."—*The Winnipeg Free Press.*

(trial subscription: $1 for six months)

THE CANADIAN FORUM

28 Wellington West Toronto

1940-41 » BOUND VOLUME « 1940-41

Would you not care to have a bound set of all four issues for permanent record?

Send in your four numbers, even though they may be soiled, together with your cheque for $1.00. In return a new bound set will be mailed at once.

R. & J. BECK LIMITED

69 MORTIMER STREET, LONDON, W.1.

Beck No. 29. London Microscope.

BECK MICROSCOPES have been chosen for the year 1940-1941 by such leading institutions as The University of Toronto, Queen's University, University of Manitoba, University of Saskatchewan, Dalhousie University, Ontario Dental College, Province of Ontario Health Dept., Toronto General Hospital, Toronto Western Hospital and several hospitals and research laboratories throughout the British Empire.

Messrs. R. & J. Beck, London, England, have developed a new type of Angular Binocular complete with all objectives.

"BUY BECK IT'S BRITISH"

Canadian Representative

JAMES PALMER

Physicians & Surgeons Building, 86 Bloor Street West, Toronto.

Every type of Quality Printing Plates

PHOTO-ENGRAVERS
ARTISTS
PHOTOGRAPHERS
ELECTROTYPERS
MATS
STEREOTYPERS

Graphic ENGRAVERS LTD. 73 RICHMOND ST. W.

York ELECTROTYPERS LTD. 119 YORK STREET

WA. 4681